Class 232.92 Book H631
General Theological Seminary Library
CHELSEA SQUARE, NEW YORK.
Besides the main topic, this book also treats of

Subject No.	*On page*	*Subject No.*	*On page*

O

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/bwb_C0-AUS-924

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF JESUS

THE
Psychology of Jesus

A STUDY OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF HIS SELF-CONSCIOUSNESS

BY

ALBERT WELLMAN HITCHCOCK, PH. D. (CLARK)

A Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of Clark University, Worcester, Mass., in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, and accepted on the recommendation of

G. STANLEY HALL.

BOSTON

The Pilgrim Press

CHICAGO

232.92
H631

Copyright, 1907, *by*
FRANK K. SANDERS

50909

The Plimpton Press Norwood Mass. U.S.A.

UNION THEOL. SEMINARY
LIBRARY
NEW YORK

Dedicated to

CENTRAL CHURCH

WORCESTER

MASSACHUSETTS

PREFACE

The standpoint from which this study is made is rather that of a layman than of a theologian, and the treatment of questions of theology is fuller and simpler in some places on that account.

Each age must get at the truth through the forms of thought given into its keeping. Out of the inherited words and the old methods of approach, the student gathers up the essential truth in every sphere and recasts it in the newer and more familiar shapes of his day. The study of the psychological development of Jesus was assured from the time when in 1863 H. Holzmann asserted that Jesus did not claim to be the Messiah until after the episode at Cæsarea Philippi. The battle-ground of criticism has been chosen in the realm of psychology of late, and scholarship is divided upon the question whether we are justified in treating the Gospels as of such historic value as to afford material for a psychology of Jesus. Our day and race do not judge historic accuracy in the same way that the first century and the writers of Palestine

estimated it. We demand objectivity where they were often satisfied with purely subjective experiences; and our prosaic, matter-of-fact minds do not always appreciate the poetic atmosphere through which the Semites saw things, and in which they wrote. This failure is the chief cause of the absurd multiplication of the sects of Protestantism.

Men of small literary culture, enthusiastic in advocating a new faith, could hardly be expected to escape subjective bias and the trend of the times. And yet, beneath all recognizable current influences without and within, an assured kernel remains in the Gospels which brings to us an outline sketch of one dominant character in unmistakable originality and power. Making all due allowances for Oriental imagination and the zeal of eager partizans; for disagreements among the evangelists due to their various points of view, and the historic conceptions which they share with writers like Livy and Tacitus, we are warranted in a careful and critical endeavor to trace the development and inner life of the man whose personality was the compelling power behind their lives as well as their narrative, and whose teachings are the chief treasure of the civilized world. There is none too much material, and it is none too well arranged, for a

Psychology of Jesus; but surely there is enough to afford us ground for study.

This is an age of psychological approach in all biography. Facts are dead until they are brought into living contact with a person, and made to take their places as contributory to his personality. We do not know a person until we have gained access to him on this inner side. How he acted, and how he reacted to experience, how he grew, and what his point of view was at successive stages of his life, what influences his experiences had upon him, and what the predominant motives were which ruled his spirit — these are the considerations raised in studying a life.

If there was no life of Christ, apart from the Gospels, until modern times, the multiplication of such attempts at biography within the last fifty years is proof of the value found in them. These lives of Christ make use of a genetic order more or less clearly traced in the Gospel story, but nowhere in English, at least, has any one given a thorough study of the psychological development of Jesus Christ. The nearest approach to it is in a book by a German scholar (Baldensperger's *Das Selbstbewusstsein Jesu*) which has recently appeared in a new edition and which has earned a high place in the litera-

ture of the New Testament student. A fertile field of suggestion and vision is opened by the psychological approach for the study and the understanding of this fascinating personality as it is pictured in the Gospels.

If Jesus was perfectly human, then we must conclude with Frederic Denison Maurice that he was therefore divine. If the race is in any true sense the offspring of God, as both Old and New Testament declare, then a perfect human being is divine. I find the character of Jesus such that he is rendered exceptional among men by his finer quality. It is therefore with a free hand that this study is undertaken, on the purely human basis. To apply the common methods of study to Jesus is not rendered impossible, even if he be all that the New Testament claims for him. A normal person, developed psychologically to fullest spiritual being, would not be removed from the action of ordinary psychological laws. He would not acquire knowledge otherwise than as his fellows do, nor would he become an authority upon matters he never studied. His mind would be keen, and his intuitions acute and accurate, but he would live like other men and grow according to genetic laws.

The story which is more revered and loved

than any other told by the lips of man; the life which opens our eyes to the fuller meanings of life as no other has done; the character which has moved the world upward more than any other — story, life, character, cannot be accounted for as the creation of imagination, however strongly the person of Jesus may have acted to draw the myths and fancies of the centuries and the races after him. Jesus is not merely an ideal of our highest dreams; he came to be that because he was a character in history first. As such a character he must be studied, in all reverence, and yet with perfect frankness, that we may read between the lines the processes by which he came "unto a fullgrown man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ."

The writer would express his great debt to the Rev. T. T. Munger, D.D., of New Haven, Connecticut, and Prof. F. C. Porter, D.D., of Yale University, who have given valuable criticism of the manuscript, and to President G. Stanley Hall, LL.D. of Clark University, under the inspiration of whose instruction and friendly interest the task has been completed.

INTRODUCTION

The author of this volume was suddenly removed by an untimely death, leaving a family and a church to mourn his loss. He had just received the degree of Doctor of Philosophy from Clark University, and this book in manuscript form had been accepted as his thesis. It is now printed as he intended, but by his widow, and without his final revision. Some fifteen years ago, when he was a student in Germany, the idea of a psychology of Jesus was first suggested to his mind by Baldensperger's Selbstbewusstsein Jesu. It has since grown with his growth, and in it are incorporated not only many of the best results of an unusually rich pastoral life, but also of diligent reading and study.

Two prominent lines of thought seem to have dominated his work: first, the progressive realism of how much Jesus owed to the best thought of his own time and to the teachings of the Hebrew schools of his own century and of that immediately preceding; and, secondly, the naturalness of Jesus' life and development.

The one, while it made Jesus not less sublime, showed him to be less isolated and more connected with the best tendencies of his own age of which he was the culmination. The other made him seem sane, normal, and less dependent upon the supernatural in claiming the reverence of the children of men. What he did and said were all human, but they were phenomena of altitude directly in the line of man's highest development, only indefinitely farther along and higher up than any others had yet attained, although not hopelessly beyond the possibilities of the higher superman that is to be, if optimism is true and if evolution is to continue. The supernatural birth was an honor, a diploma summa cum laude that his followers sometime after his death conferred upon him, not with deliberate purpose but by the deep instinct that animates the folk soul, so that it is to us a precious and standing memento of the affection and respect he inspired in those who wrought under his influence and in his spirit. So the resurrection, which the author briefly treats in Chapter XI, was chiefly a psychic or spiritual truth not less but more valid and precious as a pledge of immortality than if it were merely a crass carcous reanimation. So of miracles: "Once men believed in Christ because they believed in

miracles. Now, they believe the miracles because they believe in Christ" (p. 195). This too will only illustrate the operations of higher laws of the moral order and are supernatural, as mind and will are. "Law and not its infraction is the sign of God's presence," even though the law may not be known. He was certainly a marvelous physician, using the therapeutics of his age with superlative efficiency. Our author was profoundly impressed, as are a few other of the most progressive minds of to-day, with the conviction that the mind has a vastly greater power over the body than the world has ever yet believed and that the ministrations of religion may with great propriety begin with hygiene, bodily and spiritual. The historicity of the three resurrections which the Gospels report Jesus to have effected, the author could possibly resign with no sense of essential loss (pp. 211–13). The temptations are veracious records of the typical struggles of great souls between selfish and altruistic plans of life. Love, service of God and man are the substance of the record of both Jesus' words and deeds. Old forms of belief are deciduous and fall away of themselves when new and higher types of faith and deeper insights arise. It is worse than folly to destroy them, for the pedagogy of nature provides that

they shall quietly lapse from consciousness when higher principles appear. This book is a witness of the tendency now more and more apparent to get behind tradition and all the records and reconstruct the ideal of Jesus' life and deeds. The world needs and is slowly evolving a psychology of the evangelists and of Jesus himself. His great achievements of conscious Messianity, of divine Sonship, and of conceiving and founding a kingdom of God in the world are all in accord with the principles of a psychology vaster and higher than any that has yet been wrought out or even conceived by any of the experts now so very actively cultivating that department. He is a way more than a goal; his method of fulfilling by ever deeper explanation rather than by destroying, will make him normative for the world till there is a higher and stronger faculty in the soul than love, a loftier object for it to cleave to than God, or a nobler object to serve than mankind.

G. Stanley Hall.

March, 16, 1908.

CONTENTS

PART I

THE ENVIRONMENT OF JESUS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I	The Literature Behind the Life of Jesus	3
II	The Theology of the Jews	27
III	The World-view: Jewish, Greek and Roman	56
IV	The Social Atmosphere of Palestine	73

PART II

THE DEVELOPMENT OF JESUS

V	The Youth of Jesus	89
VI	The Temptation	117
VII	The Kingdom of God, According to Jesus	130
VIII	The Messianic Titles, as Jesus Used Them	143
IX	Jesus as a Teacher	167
X	The Miracles and the Attitude of Jesus Toward Them	194
XI	The Death and Resurrection of Jesus as He Regarded Them	218
XII	The Psychological Approach to Jesus	246

PART I

THE ENVIRONMENT OF JESUS

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF JESUS

CHAPTER I

THE LITERATURE BEHIND THE LIFE OF JESUS

Of the two forces which seem to determine life, Heredity and Environment, the latter may be more accurately traced and more exactly estimated. No study of the psychological development of Jesus can be undertaken without a careful examination of the elements engaged, however meagerly, in the shaping of his mental life and the equipment of his spirit for the work he did. Atmospheres are not easily measured, and spiritual forces cannot be traced back, like streams, with certainty to their sources, but no human being can exist in utter indifference to his surroundings nor be impervious to the influences which work upon him in his youth. It cannot be that Jesus, so intensely human in his make-up, so delicately poised and responsive as he was in the midst of friends and foes alike, grew to manhood without imbibing much from the intimate

environment of his home, his race, and the wider social forces which played upon him. We are not only warranted, but compelled, to ask what these influences were. In the first part of this study the task will be to discover the nature of the mental, moral, and physical environment of Jesus, and to set it forth accordingly.

The Old Testament is the first source of information as to the background of the life of Jesus. Under the devoted nurture of the scribes, the sacred books were not only cherished but discussed and commented upon in every word and letter. The Law in particular was expanded and refined until it was applied with nicest casuistry to every possible event, and wherever it proved inconvenient as a "regula fidei," it was handled so as to obviate difficulties and enable its devotees to evade awkward situations. The Hebrew Scriptures were read in every synagogue, and interpreted in the dialect of the people, each Sabbath day. They were studied in the schools, and no books were so familiar to the average child as these. The Old Testament, as arranged by the scribes, was classified as Law, Prophets, and Sacred Writings, and was given veneration in that order in a descending scale. The legal traditions, later gathered into the Mishna and Talmud, existed side by side with the Scriptures,

as a code of current practise. This oral law was called Halacha, or "The Way"; and Hillel was regarded as the first to organize it into a system. Haggada, "utterance," or "narrative," was the designation of all non-legal traditions, the free and various expositions of Scripture which had not the authority of the Halacha, and had to do with thoughts and fancies, not with rules for conduct.

There was great literary activity among the Jews. The Pseudepigraphical literature was growing out of the efforts to readjust the form of Old Testament history to the new conditions in which the nation found itself in religious matters, during the last Jewish and the first Christian century, and to prepare for the future. Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Moses, Elijah, Solomon, Isaiah, Baruch, and Ezra were thus honored in being made to speak to the needy hearts. Not all of these writings appeared under assumed names, nor were they all apocalyptic in content, but they shared these two characteristics quite generally.

The sixteen Apocryphal Books of the Old Testament are similar to these in their origin, but different in the style of their composition. They are in part imitations or supplements of the older books, rather than modern adaptations; in part histories of their own time. They form a body of national literature arising after the age

of canonical utterance, and, like the Pseudepigraphs, some of them pass under respected names of antiquity, although the apocalyptic element is generally wanting. While they come nearer to the historical parts of the Old Testament, they lack the prophetic power that lifts to the heights of great Messianic hopes. A German writer has called them the golden ring which weds the Old and the New Testaments.

The source of the Apocalyptic literature was the Jewish religious nature; and veneration for the canonical Scriptures determined the form. The age after the captivity was barren of great spirits. Originality and inspiration were gone. "There is no more any prophet; neither is there among us any that knoweth how long" (Psalm 74: 9; 1 Macc. 4: 46; 9: 27; 14: 41). Good men were desperate as regards their day. Pessimism was the prevalent mood. The need of spiritual comfort and hope was keenly felt, but was pointed backward, to what had been, for its satisfaction. Hence grew the reverence for the words of those who had spoken as inspired by God, and hence the growing wall about the canon.[1] Schools of students of the Law and the Prophets began to write books, expounding and expanding their precious legacy. From the same tendency sprang

[1] Schultz, Alttest. Theol., p. 371.

books which addressed the present age as the hero or father whose name they bore might have spoken, had he been in the writers' place. They represented a transcendent God and a people hopeless of better things in the present, but bound at last to recover themselves and to become supreme. When the Haggada drew out into long dissertations the words of Scripture, or turned them by a quibble or an argument of casuistry, the result was not so different in outer form from the books bearing the name of a prophet or a holy man in whose spirit they were supposed to speak. There was no hesitancy about issuing books under other men's names, for most Jewish writers, except the prophets, working in honor of God and the Church, wrote anonymously, and literary proprietorship in the modern sense was unknown. Probably the first readers did not think of the books written under the name of Enoch or Baruch or Ezra as actually emanating from the worthy named. No thought of deceit entered, on either side. As Dillmann observes, it was only a step further than the classical authors went in putting long speeches into the mouths of their heroes. Only as time passed and places changed did there arise any danger that the assumed would be confused with the real utterances of the ancients.

Since a religious need called forth these productions, their chief motives are religious instruction, warning, encouragement, and comfort. They have been styled "Tracts for Bad Times." The form yielded itself naturally to these purposes, and furnished a starting-point and an aim; the former, in the character of the one assumed to speak; the latter, in the Messianic hope. The apocalyptic *motif* begins with the Day of Jehovah, which was in an earlier time the day of conquest foretold of all the prophets, when Jehovah would scatter the enemies of the nation. More and more the Day became a time of vengeance, and only a pious remnant was to escape. The fancy of the apocalyptic writers was set free to depict, with every embellishment of Oriental symbolism run riot, the idea of this awful Day. It seems, as Mathews suggests,[1] as if a people forbidden to set forth their dreams in stone or color were driven, under tutelage of the familiar animal myths of Babylon, to paint in words the wildest visions of their fancy. Under such forms the Hope lived and flourished. Daniel and Revelation represent this literature in the Bible.

A chronological classification would be the most satisfactory for our purpose, were it not so difficult of attainment. Baldensperger has

[1] The Messianic Hope in the New Testament.

attempted it, but with much uncertainty. Professor Charles has done the same, and his work marks progress in the study of their contents; but the careless handling of the facts most significant for us by early Christian readers makes it difficult to estimate the value of these books, and lessens the significance of their dates.[1] It seems better to present the material in classes according to form of composition, and then to indicate their chronological contribution to the Messianic Hope. They can be arranged under three divisions: —

(1) Prophetic matter, including Apocalypses and Testaments.

(2) Historical Books, which work over historical material, and

(3) Lyrical and Oracle Poems.

Some such division is followed by both Dillmann and Zöckler.

The Apocalypses are in the style of the old Prophets, from the standpoint of those who held prediction to be the great and peculiar gift of prophets, and who believed that to the lucky solver of its riddles the prophetic Scripture would yield secrets of all the future. Consequently, mingled with practical comfort and hope, there is much that is vague and mysterious. A new

[1] Encyclopedia Biblia, Article Apoc. Lit.

idea of God, the world and human life was born in the Apocalypse. Vision is the favorite vehicle to carry one into the future and onward to the consummation; and so characteristic of the age is this tendency that it appears in other than the Apocalyptic Books.

1. Prophetic Matter. — The largest and most important book of this class is the Ethiopic *Enoch*, which includes, according to Dillmann, fragments of an Apocalypse of Noah. The one hundred and eight chapters are divided into sections which betray widely differing dates, from before 170 B.C. (chaps. 1 to 36), to as late as 64 B.C. (parts of 37–70).[1]

Enoch gives us the full system of the compiler's philosophy, — natural, mental and spiritual. It is a cycle rather than a book. It treats of the fall of the angels and its consequences, narrates parables of the Kingdom of the Messiah, enters the realm of astronomy and physics, and carries us in vision to the future consummation, ending with warnings of Enoch, addressed to his descendants. The text has been treated with a free hand by Christians, and is occasionally interpolated. There is an earnest Old Testament spirit pervading the whole, as the thoughts of the Messiah and his kingdom and the secrets of the seen and

[1] Charles.

the unseen world are revealed. The key-note is judgment. There is close relationship to the book of Daniel. The Son of man is described in similar language, but here (chaps. 37–70) the term is undoubtedly applied to a person, the Messiah, rather than to the people of Israel. The aim is particularistic, — to rid the readers of personal faults, rather than national, like the aim of Daniel. It is Pharisaic, rather than Sadducaic or worldly. The righteous and the sinners are the two classes. A union of Daniel's metaphysical picture and the material promises of the prophets is attempted. A new type of Messiah, appearing first in judgment at the consummation, was thus produced. Preexistent, as were Moses, the ceremonial implements, and the law, the Messiah is revealed to men and has power over their fate. He is addressed in prayer. He is called Son of man, the Elect, the Anointed, the Righteous. His principal function is that of Judge; and in the judgment he is to sit on the throne of God. The resurrection and judgment are the grand climax of all things, a poetically conceived event falling between the earth and heaven, between this age and the age to come. The fate of all men is fixed at the day of judgment. The expected punishment is in quenchless fire. Re-

wards are in some parts of the book purely physical, as a life of five hundred years, one thousand children, and a peaceful death at last. Fields are to be marvelously fruitful, and joy and gladness will reign. The heathen will be converted, Jerusalem is to be the center of the world, and the empire of the Jewish king will become universal. The Messiah in one vision is symbolized as a white bull, but he is given no duties of judge or general; he merely receives the kingdom from the hand of God (chaps. 83–90). The whole collection lacks unity. There is no one mastering idea in it. The changes are rung upon these four conceptions: a divine deliverance, a day of judgment, punishment of the wicked in fire, and resurrection of the righteous. There was in part a cutting loose from the earthly-political ideal, to go over to the supernatural. Yet by no means was there an approach to the conception of an inner spiritual kingdom in the hearts of men. Baldensperger styles the author "a Jewish Dante"; but he was without the great Italian's genius, and devoid of his inspiration in a nobler theme. Professor Charles has cited over one hundred passages where he finds contact between *Enoch* and the New Testament. Two of these appear in the Gospels, where Jesus tells the Sadducees that

the angels do not marry, and where the evil spirits are represented as beseeching Jesus not to torment them before their time.

The *Assumptio Mosis* is "an apocalyptic bird's-eye view of Moses over Israel's history,"[1] and some parts indicate the date to be as late as from 6 A.D. to 30 A.D. It seems to have emanated from one devoted to the hope of his nation, a Pharisee who protests against Sadducees or against Zealots, and it belongs to a high spiritual trend of apocalypse. No Messiah is mentioned, but the ten tribes are to return and the theocratic kingdom will be set up. God will punish his enemies in Gehenna, and the Remnant will be glorious. Under the name of Moses many books appeared, in both Jewish and Christian literature.

Fourth Ezra (2 Esdras 3: 14) is an important apocalypse written perhaps thirty years after the destruction of Jerusalem. It contains striking points of likeness to St. Paul in regard to the significance of Adam, the power of sin in human nature, and the impotency of the law. The apocalypse of *Baruch* is perhaps a composite work, written in Hebrew chiefly about 90 A.D., and comes to us only in Syriac. Schürer finds in it attempt to answer the question, "How is the calamity of Israel and the impunity of its oppres-

[1] Dillmann.

sors possible and conceivable?" It treats of the resurrection in a way that calls to mind the words of St. Paul in 1 Corinthians 15.

Ascensio Isaiæ, a composite, combines Jewish and Christian authorship, and began to appear early in the first Christian century, in Greek. The *Visio Isaiæ*, a Christian apocalypse of the end of the century, represents Christ descending through the seven heavens to liberate captives of death in Hades and then ascending to the throne of God. It employs the title "The Beloved" of the Messiah as it is used of Israel in Deut. 33: 12; Isa. 44: 2, etc.

Of Testaments, we have still a *Testamentum Duodecim Patriarchorum*, written in Hebrew and preserved to us in Greek and other versions. It is the work of two or more Jews and dates from about 130 B.C. to the early Christian decades, after which it was fully and frequently changed by additions and interpolations of a Christian character.

2. Historical Books. — Here we have illustration and application of the Old Testament historic narrative in various parts, with frequent use of legends and fairy tales for this purpose. Sometimes exegesis, and sometimes mere narrative, affords the groundwork. The purpose is prophetic, to give comfort and hope, so that there

is close relationship to the apocalypses. *Little Genesis* or *Jubilees* is the most interesting book of this class, presenting in haggadic fashion the history of the time from creation to Moses, in fifty periods of forty-nine years each. It shows a dependence upon Enoch, and ignorance of the destruction of Jerusalem. It must fall very near or just before the time of Christ. It is the work of a Pharisee in Palestine. It is anti-Roman, and seeks to ground the nation's cultus in the earliest age of history. It is of interest, as Baldensperger says, more because of the pious Jewish outlook on the world at the beginning of our era which it gives, than because of specific Messianic expressions. Rönsch calls it a "Formula concordiæ filiorum Israel," in a time when the temptation was strong to leave the old faith. It declares that God will gather the people, build among them his sanctuary, and dwell with them.

3. Lyrical Poems and Oracles. — The *Sibylline Oracles* in twelve books and fragments, probably of Alexandrian origin, are of varying age and interest. They were compiled in the sixth century and originally numbered fourteen. The third book, which interests us most, is dated from 168 B.C. to 124 B.C. and is the work of an Alexandrian Jew. Other books date from 30 to 200 A.D., and are mostly from Christian hands.

These Oracles did not have much formative influence in Palestine at an early date, because of their Alexandrian origin and essentially Greek character. The work aimed to oppose the Gentiles rather than to proclaim the Messiah. The form it assumed was popular among the Romans, who held certain sibylline oracles in very high esteem. This fact gave unusual currency to these books, and a certain fictitious value. The most striking lines of the Oracles are the following: —

"καὶ τότ' ἀπ' ἠελίοιο Θεὸς πέμψει βασιλῆα
ὃς πᾶσαν γαῖαν παύσει πολέμοιο κακοῖο
ὅσος μὲν ἄρα κτείνας οἷς δ' ὅρκια πιστὰ τελέσσας.
οὔδε' γε ταῖς ἰδίαις βουλαῖς τάδε πάντα ποιήσει
ἀλλὰ Θεοῦ μεγάλοιο πιθήσας δόγμασιν ἐσθλοῖς."

— III, 652–656.

αὕτη γὰρ μεγάλοιο Θεοῦ κρίσις ἠδὲ καὶ ἀρχή."

— III, 783.

"And then from heaven God shall send a King,
Who shall restrain all lands from evil war,
Destroying some, with others keeping oath,
Nor of his counsel shall he do all this,
Obeying wise decrees of the great God."

. . . . . .

"For this is now God's judgment and behest."

The *Psalter Solomonis* sprang from the highest spiritual level of the pious Jew, and approaches the spirit of the canonical Old Testament litera-

ture more closely than anything else of that period. Eighteen in number, these psalms are all devout prayers addressed to God as the only true King. They are of Pharisaic origin, and it is possible that they were used in the synagogue service. They bear certain marks which indicate their origin as between 63 and 48 B.C. In them the Christian can find true reverence and devotion. They reflect an unholy political usurpation on the one side, and on the other a strong expression of earnest longing for the kingdom of God (2: 36; 5: 22; 17: 1, 38). Fulfilment of the Messianic promises is expected (7: 9; 11: 16); the Anointed, the promised Son of David, is anticipated (17: 23; 18: 6) and Χριστός is the very word employed. The tone of high religious hope is sustained throughout, which fact led to the incorporation of these psalms in a few manuscripts of the Greek Bible. A comparison of them with the so-called Maccabean Psalms of our Psalter, such as 44, 74, 79, 83, gives a reason for following Calvin, Hitzig, Schürer and others in the opinion that many psalms were written in these years of inter-Testamental silence, and that here, too, one might find proof of the tendencies of the age to turn from a far-off God of glory to a gracious God of the Covenant and the theophanies of the Fathers.

In these Scriptures, most of them originating before the Christian era, we have an unconscious exhibition of the Jewish thought of the time on religion. To understand these books one must associate them with their model and father, the Book of Daniel. To understand that and its train, one must recall the history of the people about the beginning of the second century B.C. Successful for a time in their struggles against oppressors, there seemed great promise of a realization of the nation's hopes, and this literature began as an expression of them, but continued even when the struggle became desperate.

Thus far we have considered only that thought which preceded and surrounded Jesus. The best authorities, however, for his life and thought are his contemporaries. But how much have they given us of fact and reliable incident? The Gospels are still under searching criticism. The strongest opponent to those who reject the major part of the text as unhistorical and untrustworthy is the character of Jesus himself which the Gospels have pictured. If the early tradition was now and then in error, and the writers blundered here and there, they did succeed in preserving for us a most artistic result, and a priceless treasure. One must admit the validity of the criticism which discovers a certain homi-

letic tendency in the Gospels. Events are applied and expanded, teachings are explained and turns of expression or of thought are given, which the writers, however careful and exact, would naturally adopt because they had a personal interest in what they wrote. Moreover, the oldest of the Gospels, that of Mark, has least of this element, and the latest of them, the Fourth Gospel, has most of it, as one would naturally expect. Jesus was doubtless often misunderstood by his hearers, and by those who gathered and edited the Gospels, which were written to serve the practical purpose of awakening and confirming faith. Are they for this reason less exact as historical records, or are they the more accurate? They dealt with the inner life of Jesus as the most important matter in the world to the writers. This supreme interest ought to have made them more faithful witnesses to the essential and spiritual content of the gospel they cherished. They betray the Hebrew mode of thought, the Aramaic dialect, and the atmosphere of Greek thought in part, through which media we look back at the whole history and the Person who dominates it all.

A discerning and cultured English scholar has lately written:[1] "Whatever doubt men may

[1] From a College Window, by A. C. Benson, p. 346.

feel as to the literal accuracy of these records in matters of fact, however much it may be held that the relation of incidents was colored by the popular belief of the time in the possibility of miraculous manifestations, yet the words and sayings of Christ emerge from the narrative, though in places it seems as though they had been imperfectly apprehended, as containing and expressing thoughts quite outside the range of the minds that recorded them; and thus possess an authenticity which is confirmed and proved by the immature mental grasp of those who compiled the records, in a way in which it would not have been proved if the compilers had been obviously men of mental acuteness and far-reaching philosophical grasp."

Mark excels in vivid narrative and his Gospel is commonly thought to present an orderly scheme of the life of Jesus. Matthew reports the teaching of Jesus, and evidently writes with Jewish readers in mind, in part after an Aramaic written tradition. Luke comes next to these in time, and closely follows the same tradition, with intent to give a more chronological account.[1] John belongs to the second stage of thought and interest concerning Jesus and his message. The Fourth Gospel is not to be rejected as a witness,

[1] Luke 1: 1–4.

but stands rather as an interpreter of truth than as an authority for the "ipsissima verba" of history. It does not purport to be primarily a historical work, but is frankly doctrinal from the first. In general, reliance can be placed upon the accuracy of Mark, Matthew, and Luke in that order, with added assurance through agreement among them.

Jesus applies prophecy to himself only four times, according to the Gospels, — once in Mark (12: 10, 11), and three times in Luke (4: 18,19; 20: 17; 22: 37). He does not plainly say in any one of these allusions that the passage, or indeed any Old Testament prophecy, had original reference to himself. Dr. Macfarland in his recent book [1] finds explicit denial of such use in the passages Mark 12: 36, 37 and Matthew 11: 10. If I fail to find denial there, I fail also to find demonstrable claims of prophetic endorsement made by Jesus for himself as Messiah. His use of quotations seems rather to be either on the basis of the scribal custom, to meet his hearers' needs, or else as a purely spiritual assistance in making an impression for good.

The witness of other New Testament books to the thought-forms of the age and the course of events, especially the Acts and the epistles,

[1] Jesus and the Prophets.

has not been overlooked. The reaction of St. Paul against the traditional training he had received is one of the best expositions of the theology of his day and people.

It may not be amiss to print here one of the psalms of Solomon, in a translation from the Greek which generally follows that of Ryle and James, but preserves the future tense of the verbs where their rendering uses the historic tenses. This psalm contains the fullest and finest exposition anywhere to be found in Jewish writings of the conception of the Messiah which we may assume to have been most widely current in the time of Christ.

Psalm of Solomon, XVII

1. O Lord, thou art our King, henceforth and forevermore, for in thee O God our soul exulteth.
2. And what is the time of man's life upon the earth? Even according to the measure of his time, so is his hope in it.
3. But as for us, we will hope in God, our Saviour, for the might of our God endureth forever with mercy.
4. And the kingdom of our God forever, over nations in judgment.
5. Thou O Lord didst choose David king over Israel and didst swear unto him concerning his seed forever, that his kingdom should not fail before thee.

6. But in our sins, sinners rose up against us; they fell upon us and thrust us out; they to whom thou gavest no promise plundered us with violence.

7. And they esteemed not thy glorious name in praise; they set a kingdom above their own excellence.

8. They laid waste the throne of David in a tumultuous shout of triumph. But thou O God didst cast them down and remove their seed from the earth.

9. When there arose against them a man a stranger to our race.

10. According to their sins shalt thou reward them O God! May it befall them according to their works.

. . . . . .

15. In that he was an alien, the adversary wrought insolence, and his heart was alien from our God.

16. And all things whatsoever he did in Jerusalem, just so the Gentiles do in their cities unto their gods.

. . . . . .

18. They that loved the assemblies of the saints fled from them; they were scattered as the sparrows from their nest.

. . . . . .

20. Over all the earth were they scattered, and driven by lawless men. For the heaven ceased to drop rain on the earth.

21. Because there was none among them

who did righteousness and judgment, from their ruler to the least of the people, they were altogether sinful.

22. The king was a transgressor and the judge was disobedient and the people were sinful.

23. Behold, O Lord, and raise up unto them their king, the son of David in the time when thou O God knowest, that he may reign over Israel thy servant.

24. And gird him with strength that he may break in pieces them that rule unjustly.

25. Purge Jerusalem from the nations that trample her down in destruction, with wisdom and with righteousness.

26. Thrust out the sinners from the inheritance to annihilate the haughtiness of the sinful, as a potter's vessel with a rod of iron, to break in pieces all their substance.

27. To destroy the ungodly nations with the word of his mouth, so that at his rebuke the nations may flee before him and to convict sinners in the word of their heart.

28. And he shall gather together a holy people whom he shall lead in righteousness; and shall judge the tribes of the people that hath been sanctified by the Lord his God.

29. And he shall not suffer iniquity to lodge in the midst of them; and none that knoweth evil shall dwell with them.

30. For he shall know them well that they all are sons of their God, and shall divide them according to their tribes upon the earth.

31. And the sojourner and the foreigner shall

no more dwell with them. He shall judge the peoples and the nations in the wisdom of his righteousness. Selah.

32. And he shall possess the peoples of the nations to serve him beneath his yoke; and he shall glorify the Lord in a place to be seen of the whole earth.

33. And he shall purge Jerusalem in holiness as in the days of old.

34. That the nations may come from the ends of the earth to see his glory, bringing as gifts her exhausted sons,

35. And to see the glory of the Lord wherewith God hath glorified her. And he shall be a righteous king and taught of God over them.

36. And there shall be no unrighteousness in his days in the midst of them, for all shall be holy and their king shall be the Lord.

37. For he shall not put his trust in horse and rider and bow, nor shall he multiply unto himself gold and silver for war, nor by ships shall he gather hopes for the day of battle.

38. The Lord himself is his king, the hope of him that is strong in the hope of God. And he shall have mercy upon all the nations before him in fear.

39. For he shall smite the earth with the word of his mouth forever.

40. He shall bless the people of the Lord with wisdom, with gladness.

41. And he is pure from sin, to rule a great people, to rebuke princes and overthrow sinners by the might of his word.

42. And he shall not faint in his days, resting upon his God; for God shall cause him to be mighty with the holy spirit, and wise in the counsel of understanding, with strength and righteousness.

43. And the blessing of the Lord is with him in strength, and his hope in the Lord shall not weaken.

44. And who can avail anything against him? He is mighty in his deeds and strong in the fear of God,

45. Shepherding the flock of the Lord in faith and righteousness; and he shall suffer none among them to faint in their pasture.

46. In holiness shall he lead them all, and there shall be no pride among them to cause any to be oppressed.

47. This is the majesty of the king of Israel, which God knew to elevate him over Israel, to instruct him.

48. His words shall be purified above fine gold, yea above the choicest gold.

In the congregation will he judge among the peoples, the tribe of the sanctified.

49. His words shall be as the words of the holy ones in the midst of the sanctified people.

50. Blessed are they coming into being in those days to behold the good things of Israel when God shall bring to pass in the gathering of the tribes together.

51. May God hasten his mercy toward Israel! may he deliver us from the defilement of unhallowed enemies.

The Lord he is our King forever and ever.

CHAPTER II

THE THEOLOGY OF THE JEWS

WHATEVER the facts may be as to the person and the development of Jesus we cannot understand him or his teachings until we form some conception of the thought-forms and instruments of expression current in the world into which he came and to the use of which he was of necessity confined. An exhaustive study of Hebrew thought is neither necessary nor possible in pursuing the task of this book. But the Jewish theology, especially its Messianic conceptions, in so far as it seems to condition at least the expression, if not the form, of the Christian consciousness, must be known to the student of the mind of Christ.

Two dominant principles controlled Jewish religious thought throughout the period formative for the New Testament. They sprang from the popular attitude toward the Law and the popular need of a Deliverer; and thus they represent the ancient schools of the priests and the prophets. A new conception of God which

governed the religious attitude of Judaism became almost universal. The emphasis upon the Law, itself springing from and intended to carry out the national idea of God's supremacy, soon began to draw attention to the Law itself and away from God. The means superseded the end, the channel the source. An absence of great spirits to inspire and point the nation to God as King, the difficulties and oppression experienced in the State, the disheartening strife within their own numbers, where the more religious lost control and the very place and instruments of worship were in impious hands, resulted in a practical substitution of the Law for the living presence of God.[1] He was always the Creator, to the Jews. He was ever exalted. But the old prophets and poets of Israel had brought him near, into daily life. Now there were no such leaders; their places were filled by the growing school of scribes, who studied the Scriptures and extolled the Law. To them, too, God was exalted, and because he was so lofty in his being he was not involved in the low affairs of daily history and life. He had given to Israel

[1] "God stands in connection with a man in so far as the man is in connection with the Thorah. This forms the bond of union between God and men." — WEBER, *Die Lehren des Talmud*, p. 47.

a law by which his will was made manifest. That the scribes declared is all they need.[1] Their duty is to the Law, not to God in any personal relation, for God is transcendent. The only worthy part of the Old Testament is the Law; had it not been for sin the remainder had never been given to men. It is a perfect revelation for eternity (Baruch 4: 1). God has fixed his will for men there, and to it men must account. So the study of the Law is man's highest calling. God himself sits in a white robe and studies the Thorah many hours of the day. Such a God, unrelated to men save by closed decrees, cannot even be named. He is the Holy, blessed be His Name, the Place (מָקוֹם), the Eternal. His true name is secret (Enoch 69: 14 ff.); it dare not be pronounced by profane lips (Weber, p. 144; Baldensperger, p. 40).

Such an idea of God must have rested upon the consciences of the people like a constant haunting terror. The men who made study of the Law were ever in doubt and dispute themselves as to when and how the various rules they set in and about it might be broken. Nothing but uncertainty could prevail as to one's status

[1] "To learn the Thorah and to fulfill the Thorah are the two chief ends of life for the pious Israelite." — WEBER, *Die Lehren des Talmud*, p. 28.

before God. But that condition was intolerable. There must be some way of approach to God. There must be an avenue of escape. It was sought through intermediate beings, hypostatized Wisdom (Prov. 1: 20 and 8: 1 ff.; Enoch 42: 1, 6), Memra, Metatron, Schechina, etc.[1] The aim was "to help the God of Judaism in his need." Because their God was so very far removed, angels were brought in to fill the space between him and his children to whom he was not a father. So angelology flourished in high development in those days, as we see in Daniel, Enoch (39: 12), Jubilees, and in Ezekiel and Zechariah.[2] The Apocrypha and the post-exilic psalms reveal the same belief, and picture God as acting through his spiritual servants. Paul's epistles bear traces of this belief also (Gal. 4: 3, 9; Col. 2: 8, 20.) The second temple had not the power of the first in representing to the people the dwelling-place of God. They no longer saw his presence in offering and sacred furniture, and sought the absent Deity in distant speculation. But this was not enough. It gave no escape; rather the way was prolonged and the difficulties grew with the distance.

[1] Weber, p. 172; Edersheim, I, p. 47; II, p. 660.

[2] Ezekiel 3: 12, 14; 8: 2 ff.; 11: 24; 43: 5; Zechariah 1: 9, 13, 14, 19; 2: 3; 4: 1, etc.

The other principle underlying Jewish religious thought was the great heart-center of the nation's history, the Messianic Hope. Legalism and the Hope, these controlled religious thought and life; the one negative, the other positive; the one attracting about it the lawyers and theorists, the men of influence and of power, the other strong in a latent force among the people, operative in them because they stood on Jewish ground, because they sought not theory but life. But how reconcile the two, the lofty God and the present Messiah?

There were two ways: — one in asserting the medium of a forerunner, on the basis of such comforting passages as those in Malachi; the other in vague but splendid representations of a new national life, a judgment, and after that a Messianic reign, when men shall have been so prepared that they can stand before the Son of God. One way seemed more closely allied to the teaching of the prophets and looked for something similar to their work. The other took a step further and pictured in rich fancy the glory and greatness of the one coming on the clouds of heaven, typifying the Messiah who would judge them and all the earth, and reign over them. Immortality was asserted, and hope thus afforded to those whose death prevented their

eyes from seeing that day. This picture of Daniel's is taken up by Enoch and carried out; the Son of man becomes the Messiah, not only in type but in reality, and reigns in glory over all true and faithful souls, alive or risen from the dead.

The heavenly court of Daniel fitted well the regal idea of God. And yet the softening of the prospect through the age to come gave great relief. Enoch sought to make this view practical to his readers by combining with it the promises of the old Prophets which they craved. The Psalms of Solomon took their stand still firmer upon the ground of this expectation. Thus there was a double line of influence in the age, — one that of extreme legalism, the other a revolt against it in the popular heart, which found expression here and there in spiritual psalms, in apocalypse, and even in the restless and impatient schemes of Zealots and revolutionists.

We must review these ideas and others which make up the theology that was current when Jesus lived, and which must have had their influence, positive or negative, upon him.

God was so infinitely above the world and so ineffably pure that he held no relation with the creation save through intermediates. He dwelt

apart in a heaven of everlasting happiness and feasting. Man could win his approval only through the keeping of the Law, which was the revelation of his will. The two most important duties of a religious man were, first to preserve ceremonial purity (John 18: 28; Matt. 23: 25), and second, to observe all fasts and feasts and ceremonies prescribed by the Law or by its accumulated tradition. Not morals, but ceremonial, became the expression of religion. To meet God one must segregate himself from his fellows, not deal lovingly with them. The man who kept the Law was pleasing unto God, whatever his spirit or his conduct toward men.

Angels were deputed to fill in the vast chasm between a God who was too holy to approach his creation and his creatures on the earth. The ancient polytheistic and animistic beliefs in ministering spirits which serve God had never wholly disappeared among the Jews. The Hebrew word for angels (מַלְאָכִים, messengers) is not their only designation; they are elsewhere termed sons of God, gods, powers, heroes, holy ones, and the heavenly host. They partake of the nature of fire (Ps. 104: 4), and are innumerable. "Holy is the Lord of spirits," Enoch says (39: 12), "he filleth the earth with spirits." Names are assigned to various indi-

viduals among them. Tobit (12: 15) mentions seven archangels, and Enoch (20) names six: Uriel, Raphael, Raguel, Michael, Saraquael, Gabriel; and Jeremiel is added in other passages. Tobit's archangels present the prayers of the saints, and go in before the glory of the Holy One like the seven counselors of the Persian king. There are references to them in 1 Thess. 4: 16; 1 Tim. 5: 21; Jude 29; Rev. 4: 5; 8: 2. Many other names are given here and there, and ranks are assigned to them. Uriel (אוּר, light) is the regent of heaven and its starry hosts (Enoch 20: 2; 33: 3); Raphael is the angel of healing (Tobit 3: 17; Enoch 40: 9); Michael is the guardian angel of Israel (Enoch 10: 13, 21); Gabriel is given first place in the Mohammedan angelology; Jeremiel rules the spirits of the dead (Enoch 20; 4 Es. 4: 36); Sandalphon stood on the earth, but his head arose a journey of five hundred years beyond the living creatures, where he made crowns for the Creator; Sagsagel taught the Sacred Name to Moses, and beheld his death on Nebo.

These ranks and orders of ministering spirits betray a Persian influence. They did the work of creation; they built the ark of the covenant; they dwelt in all natural forces, thunder and lightning, storm and wind, and hail; in springs,

plants, animals; they gave the Law to Moses, guarded the wealth deposited in the temple, acted as guardians of the good, and carried their souls at death to Abraham's bosom. New Testament references to them are fairly numerous, but do not approach those of the rabbinic lore in frequency (Matt. 13: 39 ff.; 16: 27; 18: 10; 24: 31; 25: 31; Mark 8: 38; 12: 25; 13: 32; Luke 16: 22).

Progress in the doctrine was rapid, from the close of the canon until the time of Christ. A new angel was said to be created to discharge every commandment of God. "There is not a stalk of grass upon earth," said the rabbis, "but it has its angel in heaven." The four chief angels, Gabriel, Raphael, Michael and Uriel stood about the throne.

Evil spirits also existed for the Jew, in an organized kingdom of darkness, under the reign of Mastenia, Satan, Belial, Beelzebub, Azazel, the Devil, the Tempter, the Tormentor, or the Prince of Darkness, as their king was called. There are unnumbered hosts prepared to do his bidding, the "powers of the air," the "powers of darkness." They wander about, often in dry and desolate places. They cause disease like rabies, angina pectoris, asthma, croup, leprosy, and possess themselves of both body and spirit.

They may be exorcised by him to whom God gives the power, through the agencies of prayer and touch. The origin of these evil spirits is traced to the union of the sons of God and the daughters of men (Gen. 6). Physical evil crept into the world through these fallen angels. Belief in demons is older than belief in the devil, for it sprang from the earliest animism and survived everywhere [1] in the age of Jesus, even in the Pauline epistles, as well as the Gospels.

The hidden realms of beneficent and malevolent beings all about them gave the Jews a constant sense of the supernatural. It seemed to be ever on the point of breaking through into their own experience in signs and miracles. Whatever was not understood was explained by reference to this mysterious sphere.

In the Jewish thought of righteousness a national rather than an individual asset was postulated. It began in political emancipation, and after that repentance was a necessary element. Here, if anywhere, came in the prophetic idea of the presence of God and vital religious feeling. The best of the spiritual leaders taught a faith in the moral supremacy of God, subjecting the world to himself, and believed that

[1] Enoch 7: 8; 65: 69; Jubilees 10: 11; Josephus Ant. VIII, 46 f.; War, VII, 180 f.

through the reign of righteousness blessings were to come upon all.

Sin was recognized, as it always has been by religious minds, as the antithesis of the best, against which the soul must struggle. Man was considered a free moral agent, but two unavoidable sources of corruption lay deep within each life. These were, first, the body itself, which was from the ground, and essentially evil; and secondly, the historic and hereditary taint derived from the Fall. The task of all was to make good conquer evil, through obedience to the Law of God. Through the Tempter, man became mortal, and since then goodness is harder to acquire and therefore more meritorious. Guilt, but not sin, is handed down from father to son.

The Talmud teaches that some men are sinless, even after the Fall, because they keep the whole Law. A child cannot sin. Sin is universal only in the sense that all men are potentially under evil influence. Physical evil is the punishment of sin. Death is the result of the Fall, though it is sometimes referred to natural causes, or even to foreordination. The soul is preexistent, as all good things are in Jewish thought. It is compelled to enter the body, even against its will. At death the soul will return to the

upper world. It should therefore be kept pure, if possible, in the body.

According to the Midrash Tanchuma, seven things existed before the world was: — the throne of God, the law, the temple, the patriarchs, Israel, the name of Messiah, and repentance. Sometimes paradise and hell are added; sometimes they are substituted for the patriarchs and Israel in the list. Elsewhere these are spoken of not as preexisting, but merely as prearranged.

Immortality was not by any means the universal faith of the Jews. As the Old Testament in many places fails to declare definitely for anything more than a sort of unconscious, pallid life beyond the grave, and gives us no settled doctrine of the future of the soul, so the Jews lacked a fixed eschatology. Some held to a transcendental view of the coming Kingdom, and a resurrection of the dead to participate in it; others denied both articles of belief. On the other hand, the Hellenistic ideas of immortality, based in philosophy, attained considerable influence. Thus there were three tendencies in respect to immortality: — that which followed the book of Daniel, connecting the new faith with the future Kingdom; that which fell under Greek philosophical influence, coming in upon the Jews from Alexandria; and that which pinned its faith to the

earthly kingdom and denied both immortality and resurrection.

The Kingdom was the central and common factor in all shades of belief. Israel, to all the Jews, was itself the Kingdom of God. He had chosen the nation, as the prophets taught. He had covenanted with them. The sufferings of past years and centuries was the discipline from which should emerge a nation purified and fit to be the people of God. Their loss of independence was a great strain upon this faith, and the rise of the world-powers around them dazed and discouraged them. But their thought was enlarged and deepened. They held fast to this ancestral faith, and persisted in expecting a re-establishment of a dynasty and a power on the earth all their own. At present they could only dream; for the future there was hope.

They made a sharp distinction between present and future, earth and heaven. God is there, not here, and his place on earth has been usurped. The lower Israel sank in the scale, the keener was this distinction made. No gradual change could ever bring things out as they should be, but sudden cataclysms must occur to set things right. God alone can restore the Kingdom to Israel in his good time. The only thing a man can do is to practise righteousness and keep the

Law assiduously. He can help things along by repentance for past and present lapses and transgressions, but into the midst of the saddest moral degradation the powers of heaven must come to bring the Kingdom in.

This expected triumph of the Jews involved an earthly realm, to be world-wide in its extent, and promised all earthly bliss for the faithful, but punishment and desolation unspeakable for the unfaithful Israelite as for the nations in their pride. It had a decided tinge of vengeance in it, often luridly portrayed. Since it was to come from heaven,[1] where in one sense it already existed, the popular phrase was "The kingdom of heaven" rather than "The kingdom of God." Political and religious hopes were merged inextricably.

This tendency of thought prepared the Jew for the Greek transcendentalism of Alexandria. The Hebrew mind traveled from the thought of a divine revelation to which it always clung, downward toward earth, which it found so hostile to God and all goodness, and asked an explanation of matter and life. The Greek mind

[1] The origin of the phrase "kingdom of heaven" is probably not in the apocalyptic localizing of the kingdom directly, but, as Schürer points out, in the use of heaven for God, according to Jewish veneration for the name. Note this practise in Daniel and 1 Maccabees.

reversed the process, seeking for divine revelation as a solution of the problem of human thinking which it did not trust. Instead of endless speculation, the Greek demanded an immediate knowledge, through vision or ecstasy. The consequent transcendentalism led to essential dualism. Matter and spirit took their places over against each other. Matter was the eternally formless stuff from which God made the world. It was the source of evil, as the Persians taught. Salvation was sought through knowledge, by which they meant a mystical vision and spiritual sympathy. Ignorance thus, as well as matter, becomes a source of sin. Thus a more individualistic movement began under Greek influences than was possible in the stiff nationalism of the Palestinian faith. But even then no man was sure of the favor of God save by his doing prescribed things, and no man ever knew exactly where he stood in the reckoning. Pride and grave uncertainty went hand in hand. Contrary to the rabbis, these new teachers held that man is by nature sinful, and did not rest back upon the Fall in accounting for sin. They imputed free will to the soul, and taught that this choice was exercised even when the soul came into the body it was to inhabit.

The most significant doctrine for us in ap-

proaching the study of the spiritual development of Jesus is that of the Messiah. It might be treated as part of the doctrine of the Kingdom, with which it is indivisibly united, but it has secured a field and form of expression all its own. In New Testament times it was developing rapidly, both generally and in definite content. It was the abiding kernel of the Hope which had warmed the hearts of a discouraged and well-nigh desperate people for four hundred years.

Utopias are always interesting, and a natural history of the Utopias of literature would be a readable book. These dreams of ideal conditions are born not in times of plenty and prosperity like our own, but under the pinch of want, or in the woes of oppression. When people cannot get what they need, when their state is impoverished and their liberties are curtailed, they resort to dreams, and imagination builds them houses for a season. Thus Plato's Republic, More's Utopia, and Bacon's Atlantis sprang into being. The eternal Hope of Israel produced its fairest flowers when the nation suffered most and the need was greatest for the comfort and reenforcement of the individual soul. Thus, too, it chances that with dreams of their own betterment join visions of a vengeance upon their foes which is almost as sweet to them as their

joy, by the satisfaction of the sense of justice which it brings. Many a helpful and uplifting psalm is spoiled for us by this fly in its precious ointment, and the vindictive, even brutal words seem foreign to the noble spirit that appeals to our religious sense. Yet both parts belong to the people who produced these psalms, and both elements have a place as obverse and reverse in the Messianic Hope of the Jews. On the one side vengeance is assured upon their enemies; on the other the nation is to be supreme.

The Jews, in the time of our Lord, were controlled largely in their Messianic expectation by what they had inherited. The mediate gifts of prophecy and the first temple had been overshadowed and displaced in the hands of its mediators, their fathers, so that the life of it was gone. A spiritless age, when no prophet appeared, led to writing in the name and after the method of the older prophets, by men who felt within them conviction of truth, or longing to comfort the dejected. Another development was seen in scribism, from the time of Ezra on. He was both priest and scribe. Gradually, the subject of the Law and its teaching became the possession of a class of learned scholars who held no priestly office. They assumed or won a place of authority in all questions of interpretation, and in their

zeal at protecting and applying the Law they magnified it as the only hope of the nation. So the class called סוֹפְרִים, *γραμματεῖς, νομικοί, νομοδιδάσκαλοι*, arose, winning highest respect of the people, and the title, later in our New Testament age, of רַבִּי. These men were zealous Israelites, and naturally shaped the religious life of the people. By choice most of them were Pharisees. For the laity, for the priest, the sacred Book and the sacred *Letter* became ever more uniquely authoritative.[1] "Ethic and Theology were swallowed up in Jurisprudence."[2]

After two centuries of effort to attenuate personal faith and to translate the spiritual into legalism, we cannot expect to find the purest and the best spirit of the Davidic Psalms, combined with the noblest product of later prophecy, in the popular conception of the time of Christ. On the other hand, it is equally an error to deny all expectation of a personal Messiah. The books that were then popular combine the wheat and the chaff, and we cannot be untrue to history, as it is surely not untrue to human nature, if we claim that the craving for the living truth made them read and treasure these books. The general idea of God was a colorless one. He

[1] Ewald in Schultz. [2] Schürer.

was cold, unmindful, pitiless. But the very perfection of the transcendental led to the union with it of something else by the people. It must always be so. The Huguenots in a godless land and even at the licentious court of the Regent Duke of Orleans; the Puritans by the side of the Cavaliers of Charles I; John Wesley's protest against dead dogmatism and proclamation of free grace; to say nothing of the brightness in the "Dark Ages" kindled by the Orders which had lighted their torches at the altar of God's love, — every new start in the progress of religion and of truth can be seen to develop from darkness and opposition. So the fact of spiritual life among the Jews (proved by such writings as we have cited, climaxed in the Psalms of Solomon) necessitates an expression of itself somewhere among the people whose history had always been governed by "one far-off, divine event" looked for through the ages. It is impossible to conceive of all Messianic expectation as having died out among them. "It was by no means a religiously torpid age; on the contrary, there is reason to believe that there was a well-defined feeling of discontentment in the best minds; — a desire for something purer and higher than had yet been attained."[1] At the

[1] Toy, p. 417.

same time it is equally impossible that the hope they entertain could be free from the many defects and formative influences of their national and personal training.

The Law had usurped the place of sacrifice, of temple and of God to such a degree that it dominated the religion of the day in many minds. God was represented by it. The temple, according to the Talmud (Jer. Taanith 65), did not contain many things that the tabernacle and Solomon's temple held. Among the missing was the Holy Spirit, even in the gorgeous building of Herod. At least they were not sure of God's presence in the temple (Enoch 89: 73; Psalms of Solomon 1: 8; 2: 3; 8: 12, 26). Josephus (Ant. iii, 8, 9) declares that the stones in the high priest's breastplate ceased to shine during his official services about 100 B.C. Yet the temple was by no means forsaken. The warm spiritual piety of the Psalms and the Prophets never wholly forsook it. It was "his Father's House" to the ideal Jewish youth. Twenty-nine years later, the popular reverence for it was great enough to make an accusation of threatening to destroy it a charge sufficiently grave to justify sentence of death. And ten years later still, a mass of people of all ages fairly besieged the Governor Petronius for forty days, petitioning

him not to desecrate the sacred building with the statue of Caligula the emperor.

The oldest Rabbinical books set the Thorah at a higher worth than this temple. And the multiplication of synagogues proves the tendency among leaders to substitute for the centralized system a dependence on the Thorah; for worship, moral observance; for the cultus, faithful study of the scribal deliverances and interpretations. Essenism, in its revolt against the temple sacrifices and ritual, was only a symptom of widespread discontent. Hellenism had come into the nation with its philosophy, and Rome with its idolatry and power. The former brought assurances of immortality of the soul, the latter drove the Jew further on in his conception of the exaltation of Jahveh. The Pharisee was the only faithful follower of Law and God, and of a hope which made a resurrection possible and assured him of a new age and a Kingdom to come, because it was written in the book in heaven. All history is but an unfolding of what God has fixed there (Daniel 10: 21; 12: 1; Enoch 39: 2; 81: 1).

This religious hope called for those things which the present denied to the religious nature. They may be gathered about two centers: —

(1) God's presence, on earth, in wisdom, in

the temple, in communion with men, in his Son.

(2) The Kingdom of God, in his Son, in knowing him here, in judgment, in the teleology of a Messianic age.

Herod the king was troubled at the birth of one expected by Wise-men, and chief priests and scribes could tell him, in the wisdom of their lore, where the Anointed should be born. An aged Simeon and Anna in the temple were waiting for the consolation of Israel, with an audience of "all them that were looking for the redemption of Jerusalem," to whom to speak of the "light for the unveiling of the Gentiles, and the glory of thy people Israel." The same expectation is found in the preaching of John, whose disappointment in a course of action so un-Messianic as was Jesus' life speaks plainly of the character of his hope. The anxious mother would never have brought her sons to ask for them places in the Master's kingdom, if she had not had natural and definite ideas as to that which she asked, gained from other sources than her sons' accounts of the Master's teaching.

But we have other proofs in the rising of Theudas the enthusiast and of Judas of Galilee, mentioned by the Pharisee Gamaliel (Acts 5: 33 ff.) and by Josephus as well. From pa-

triotic Galilee some had gone forth, earnest men, lovers of country, feeling that the time had come for throwing off the foreign yoke. The prophetic great sorrow and tribulation seemed to many a heart to have been upon them, and the only reason for delay in bringing out the concealed Messiah seemed the inactivity of the people. A personal Messiah was expected. Josephus assigns the title to Vespasian, in his double oracle. Herod thought to win the Messiah's crown by building the temple, as the prophecies of Zechariah suggest that the temple-builder will be the nation's deliverer. One cannot fail to endorse the opinion of Hausrath, that this expectation of a personal Messiah is the basis of the presentation of the New Testament history.[1] (Matt. 11: 2; 17: 10; 27: 11; Luke 2: 25–38; Matt. 15: 22; Luke 24: 2–7; compare Acts 1: 6; Luke 3: 15). "It is not a wonder," says Hausrath (p. 184), "that Jesus came as Messiah, but that he came just now."

The conception of a personal Messiah was, in some respects, the hardest one for the age. It was in things and states, not in personal representation of God as King, that the main hope lay. So the conception of a *Forerunner* was frequent, from Malachi (3: 1–5) to Sirach (48: 9 ff.)

[1] Hausrath, I, p. 181.

and 1 Maccabees (45: 46; 14: 41), to which the apocalyptic representation in Daniel fitted admirably. But the correlation of Forerunner and Messiah was rarely if ever completed in one mind. Some held to the one, some to the other. Even in Samaria there was religious excitement under a certain Goet (Josephus xviii, 4, 1), at about the time of the preaching of John the Baptist (compare 2 Macc. 2: 4–8, where such activity as Goet's in restoring old relics is assigned to the Messiah). John the Baptist carried the teaching of Enoch and the schools of the scribes into action. Leaving promises, he laid foundations for the Kingdom, and offered a definite outlet for the faith of the age. The Kingdom ceased to be a matter of distant visions, and became a near and present reality. The Samaritans confused the Kingdom with the restoration of physical conditions; the Jews still expected to use force of arms; John alone taught a Kingdom of ethical fitness and spiritual renewal. A saying of the schools, possibly after Christ, but normative of the thought, ran as follows: "If all Israel would together repent for a single day, the redemption by Messiah would ensue." There was a section of the more seriously minded among the people who looked for a Messiah of superhuman nature, but even they expected that

he would use his divine powers to overthrow the Roman might and establish a kingdom on earth.

Wendt[1] has analyzed the Hope into three separate phases: expectation of a Messianic King; a conception of the personal salvation of individual pious men; and an emphasis upon the ethico-religious character of the expected condition of salvation. Zöckler affirms that the Messianic was bounded by a narrow circle among the people, that with the masses it was a side issue, or latent. One can readily grant his assertion, but at the same time add the conviction that it was latent as the magnetism of the magnet is latent, only waiting for an exciting cause to respond. "This ardent hope with respect to the nation, which existed in all true Jewish hearts, was directed into a more definite channel when they believed in a Messiah, and all the beliefs involved in or suggested by the vaguer hope naturally came to be connected more or less directly with the Messiah and his time. They may thus, not unfitly, themselves be called Messianic. The figure of the Messiah looms on the view of the Jewish people, gradually gathering more and more distinctness, against the background of such anticipations as these."[2]

[1] Inhalt der Lehre Jesus, II, 132. [2] Stanton.

The old prophetic expectation was treated much as the later Catholic Church treated the chiliasm of the apostolic eschatological expectation; yet there was an earnest inner looking for relief of heart and life, just as there has always been an optimism in the Christian Church that looks for ultimate conquest by the life-power of Christ.

Our analysis of the Hope of the age results in the emphasis of two elements of power, — a national and a personal. The national element was dim, far off, general in its form, of many phases; and through long postponement of its satisfaction had developed into the vagueness of apocalyptic visions. Yet there was earnestness and reality in it, for in time of greatest oppression it grew brightest and found more frequent expression. Historically, it was a continuation of the promises of the prophets.

It is also evident, alike in the apocalyptic literature and in the New Testament, that there was a more personal, religious, ethical side to the Hope of the Jews. The long waiting and the fearful suffering had operated to focus in a Deliverer the religious faith of many. How could the Jews of the second Christian century have come into possession of such a strong and definite personal hope, if they had not received

it, at least in germ, from their predecessors of the time of Christ?

This purely personal element was a reaction against the legalism of the scribes and its entailed notions of God and of the relation of man to him. It grew and found force among the people, fed on the Psalms, on the Prophets, and on all elements of religious hope which came to it, whether from Semite or from Greek. It sought an avenue to God, a representative of him, a communion with him. It found utterance in the Maccabean Psalms of our canon, in the Psalms of Solomon, and in the restless, crying needs of the people seeking John and Jesus.

To sum up the Messianic doctrine briefly, its chief points were these: The present is a time of evil, for Satan rules, and we must suffer pain, disease, and death at his hands. Judgment will surely come, when the enemies of Israel will all be punished. The Gentiles will be extinguished utterly, or at least subdued. Then the age of joy and gladness will come in, the gift of God through that great catastrophe by which God will ascend his throne of judgment. The new kingdom then will appear, the Kingdom of heaven. It is limited by some writers to four hundred years, by others one thousand years,

until God assumes the rule of all men. The righteous, it was generally believed, would rise from the dead and enter into the joys of this Jewish kingdom on the earth. The transition to the new age was to be with fearful birth-pangs. Usually a personal Messiah was expected, although mention of him is often obscure. He was to be especially set apart, and was even supernatural in character. Here and there the coming of Elijah as his forerunner was proclaimed. Justin Martyr alludes to a tradition that the Messiah would not know his own mission, as Saul and David did not know theirs, until he was anointed by Elijah.[1] He was to be hidden until suddenly revealed by Elijah. An ideal man, a prophet, he was to be sinless and pure. Thus the two ages, this, and the age to come, were distinguished in the program of the theologians; and the hardships of the present were resolved in the glory of the prospect set before the pious souls.

Judaism as it ebbed away in its latter days and evaporated under the hot sun of oppression, defeat, and its own zealous legalism, left a residuum of real value, which indeed was destined to provide Christianity with its richest treasure. This legacy was provided under three fundamental

[1] Dialogue c. Trypho., Sec. 8.

forms of thought: First, the Hebrew system gave us a settled idea of God the Creator, behind and beneath all things, a sovereign power. Secondly, we have received from this source a system of morals which, if it was negative, was strict, and if it insisted too strongly upon good works, did not want inner spirit and the true requirements of a righteous life. Thirdly, Judaism handed on the beginnings of a doctrine of the resurrection, not only for the race in apocalyptic vision, but also for the individual, because of this wider expectation. It was the religion of hope, and therefore it was bound itself to rise again to newness of life in Christianity.

CHAPTER III

THE WORLD-VIEW: JEWISH, GREEK AND ROMAN

THE Jews of the days of Jesus were dispersed over the entire Roman world. Those in Palestine held closely to the ideas and prejudices of their ancestors. With a tenacity born of racial spirit, and bred by generations of strictest religious training, protected by the hard shell of their peculiar ceremonial and their extreme veneration for the Law, they looked out upon the world from their little ancestral valley of the Jordan and the surrounding hills with the same vision that their fathers had had for five hundred years. The growth of world-powers about them, the trampling down of their country by contending armies, the tossing to and fro of their little province as a slight and despised pawn in the greater game of nations, — all this experience tended to shut them in more securely than ever, and to increase to hatred their religious disdain of all Gentiles. They were convinced that the world was made for them; that they were the Chosen of God, who in his own good time would

restore to them their lost autonomy, and entrust to them the government of the world after he had sufficiently punished all their enemies.

With a national consciousness so severe, so audacious, so insurmountable and indestructible, the Jews had very definite notions about things. They despised and hated Greek and Roman alike. Upon all their civilization they looked down with contempt. They were often engaged in quarrels with their neighbors, the Samaritans, who were enough like them to excite their bitterness. Those of their own number who in any way betrayed the nation's pride or compromised with the world about them, or forgot the rites of their religion or sold themselves to the foreigner for gold, were looked upon with holy horror and were outcasts everywhere. The strictest sect, the Pharisees, having in their hands the educational forces of the synagogues scattered everywhere among the people, impressed the Law upon each plastic mind and hunted any heresy with keenest scent. Religion was a form of patriotism, institutional in method and formal in content. The temper of the Jewish mind was ethical rather than speculative, and practical rather than philosophical. The production of well-wrought epigrams and striking phrases, rather than reasoned systems, was in accord with

the inheritance of a people whose literature included no distinctly philosophical book, and whose language possessed no word equivalent to the Greek ὁ κόσμος.[1]

After more than seventy-five years of attempted union of civil and religious leadership in the person of the high priest, upon the death of Alexander Jannæus in 78 B.C., a new instrument of government appeared in the Sanhedrin. It was an ecclesiastical body, and was early tempered to the Pharisaic standards. At that time the severity of the Pharisees forced most of the people of a broader culture into sympathy with the Sadducees, and laid the foundations for years of bitter opposition between the two parties. In 63 B.C., Pompey took Jerusalem for Rome with dreadful slaughter. In 40 B.C., Herod was established by the will of Rome as king, and proceeded to destroy every sign of the Asmonean family which had been claimants of the ecclesiastical and civil power for more than one hundred and twenty-five years.

Upon these people, of such stormy history, so hard to conquer, so unable to realize when they were defeated, the Greek and the Roman in turn looked with contempt as keen as that which the Jew felt for his Gentile overlord. Everywhere

[1] Dalman, The Words of Jesus, p. 162.

society was divided into two parts by race peculiarities. Thrown upon their own resources, herding together, compelled to rely upon their countrymen for everything, and avoiding all close contact with the foreigner, the Jews were a peculiar people to the Romans, who could not understand their temper or appreciate their better qualities. There was a middle wall of partition between Jew and Gentile in actual practise higher than that prescribed by the Law.

In spite of their segregation the Jews did receive much from others. It was an age of syncretism in religion which none could resist. "At no other time perhaps," writes Harnack, "in the history of religion, and in no other people, were the most extreme antitheses so closely associated under the binding influence of religion." They looked upon matter as evil in itself, as the Persians were wont to do. They had adopted a dualism that ran through life, and divided not only the visible but the invisible, and even the world to come. They had begun to work out a doctrine of immortality for the righteous. They had also adopted a scheme of angelology, partly at least of Persian origin, and peopled the earth with spirits good and bad. Through these unseen but ever-present attendants, they accounted for the unaccountable, and were ready to explain

disaster as a sign of bad spirits at work upon them or about them.

There were two forms of Messianism among them. One was transcendental, and exhausted itself in writing and reading apocalypse. The other was revolutionary, and with short patience was seeking to hurry on the crisis. The upper classes, having suffered less, and being better trained in thought, were given to transcendentalism; but the poor, the oppressed, the ignorant and suffering were ready for the torch and violence against the foreigner who lorded it over them. Small chance had they of success, but thus they expressed their Hope.

One common cause for restlessness was the generally accepted belief that theirs was an age of transition between the futile past and a future big with promise. The prophetic forecast of the Kingdom belonged to the nation as a whole. Only those who had gone over to the Greek influence altogether, failed to cherish this ancestral Hope. It warmed the hearts of the common people and became a watchword with the pious everywhere. It was a favorite topic of speculation with the rabbis and the scribes. It filled and vitalized the imaginative pages of the writers of Apocalyptic literature. It was the theme of the loftiest poetry of the day. It was

almost an obsession of the people, and whenever their lot was hardest to bear this demand upon the future was made with renewed intensity.

"The religion of a given race at a given time is relative to the mental attitude of that time."[1] We must therefore seek to estimate the main currents of the mental life of the dominant races in Palestine at the beginning of the Christian era, in order that we may understand the atmosphere which one born there would breathe. We must look not only to the immediate Jewish environment, but also to the forceful influences of Greece and Rome which penetrated every nook and cranny of the land. Philo had not hesitated to lay hands upon the treasures of Greek philosophy, Platonic and Stoic alike, and to wed them to the scriptures of his people, so that every Hellenizing Jew was becoming familiar with the resultant teaching. Jewish thought was not a stranger to Greek forms, as is proved in the writings of the Sibyl and the Septuagint. The Jew of the Dispersion, who had inherited no philosophy, was striving to adjust his theology to the current dualism of the Platonic school or the monism of the Stoics. The practical Romans and the metaphysical Greeks influenced the Hebrews by indirection more than by immediate contact,

[1] Hatch, Hibbert Lectures, 1888.

but none the less deserve consideration as factors in the making of the medium in which Jesus grew.

Rome was at her highest in power, and her best in expression of it, when the first Christian century dawned. She ruled the world, and saw the influence of her civilization dominating life upon three continents. The world was a Roman world. Greek culture and Roman law were amalgamated in social institutions, and prevailed in the state. Happiness of the individual was the universal end. Egoism ruled, and even those who followed Plato in his doctrine that the only happiness rests in virtue, and that the highest good lies in God, dropped to a very common egoism in concrete action. The school of Aristotle, more practical, was no less egoistic; and the Stoic taught the virtue of a safe ritual within the soul itself, where no appeal to outer things could reach. The high-minded teaching of Epicurus was open to interpretation which made it a system of palliation for wrong-doing and defense of personal weakness. He formulated a scheme of morals which should guarantee a happy life, and noble men like Lucretius sought to realize it. His far successors lowered the standard of happiness which he set. Under shelter of his name, and using his theory that vir-

tue is of no value save as it contributes to an agreeable life, they forgot that true pleasure must be for the whole life, not in the enjoyment of the hour, — for the soul, not for the body, — and gave themselves up to sensual delights and immoralities. The fifth philosophic school, the New Academy, set as its standard of right that which is considered honorable. Decorum, not inner worth, was their aim, and whatever left a man unblamed by his fellows was virtuous.

There was no inclusive idea of humanity, but instead of it, each man saw the immediate relation of the various classes and conditions to himself. Self-interest, as Epictetus was wont to say, became the father, brother, country, god of men. Cicero confessed, "We have neither true right, nor true justice; we have only a shadow, a feeble reflection."[1] No man existed apart from the state, of which he was a part and to which he owed everything. The Greek and Roman defined all other men as "barbarians," not quite on the level of their humanity, but nearer that of the slave, who by nature was inferior. A deep and settled contempt for all who were not Greek or Roman pervaded the age. Men like Cicero regarded every foreigner as an enemy. Indeed, the Latin word for stranger means a foe. No

[1] Schmidt, The Social Results of Early Christianity, p. 108.

idea of one human race was found in their philosophy. Aristotle's idea, that only those with property enough not to be obliged to work deserve the title of citizen, was generally held; and the consequent aristocrary of wealth, the most dangerous and unworthy aristocracy possible, was in power. Humility, meekness, self-sacrifice, were regarded with contempt. No friendship was thought worth while which did not prove advantageous, and it rarely lasted through time of need.

Roman society was indifferent to the traits we associate with high sentiment and fine character. It was self-centered and mean. Woman was oppressed and considered inferior to man. Marriage was regarded rather as a duty to the state than a matter of personal preference or affection. Public morals were in a general decay. Even Vespasian and Marcus Aurelius were not ashamed to maintain their concubines before the world. Thus woman was debased in her most sacred self, and made the tool of the lustful impulses of the sex in power. A pure and loyal wife was a rarity in Rome, and even women of noble families caused their names to be enrolled among the courtezans that they might escape punishment for their amours. In spite of legislation and imperial edicts, woman sank to lower depths and marriage became a farce.

Plato and Aristotle both taught that it was not worth while for the state to rear deformed or puny children, and advised the poor to practise abortion rather than load undesired infants upon the public. Education was planned to fit the child to serve the state. Plato suggested that all children of aristocratic families should be given over to public nurses and their identity lost to their parents. Boys were trained for politics and girls for lives of submission. As parents grew dissolute, children were neglected, left to incompetent and corrupting servants, or sent to public schools, where they were subject to few ennobling influences and no moral restraints. No boy could learn a trade, for that would lower him in popular esteem. Artisans of every kind were held in disdain. All money-getting occupations, excepting the professions or great commercial enterprises, were rejected as unworthy of citizens and fit only for slaves. In consequence those who were compelled to work hated it. Slaves were considered to be of a lower order of being and a natural necessity. They did most of the work. A mass of turbulent, dissatisfied people filled Rome and grew poor in the midst of its luxury. They had no place of refuge in sickness, and no charity was open to them in distress.

These conditions extended to the provinces, and there the experiences of Rome were repeated. Human life was cheap and often sold for a holiday. Man had fallen miserably into a false philosophy and an inhuman practise. He needed to be rescued and given a new ideal, a better philosophy, and a kindlier spirit. Coarseness, cruelty, passion, and vanity were characteristic of men in personal relations, and the pillars of society tottered in their places. Greed and luxury had brought their inevitable degeneracy, with ennui from surfeit.[1] The cruelties of the arena, and the butcheries of pagan captives to make sport for the crowd, were popular with rich and poor alike. One honors those Saxon prisoners who, when condemned to fight each other before a crowd, were found to have taken their own lives.

Here and there a nobler mind saw with indignation the trend of society. Tacitus mourned over his Annals, Lucretius wrote his high philosophies in the style of the ancient Greeks, and Juvenal composed his mordant satires on the times; while Seneca the Stoic wrote his moral treatises and Cicero speculated "On the Nature of the Gods." Popular religions and established rites of sacrifice indicated human need of expres-

[1] Seneca, De Ira, II, 8. De Brev. Bit., 16.

sion for the spiritual sense, but their influence ended in a moral impotence.

It is doubtful if the Greeks, recognized by St. Paul as "very religious," surpassed the Romans, who gathered together all the "shreds and patches" of religion that the world produced, and developed a deep and general superstition. "Never did the religious life of man offer a more bewildering multiplication and variety."[1] As a measure of safety, they undertook to treat all gods alike, and thus, offending none, to aid their chances of good fortune. Such an eclecticism could issue only in doubt. As usual when doubt prevails, faith in the miraculous was widespread. The social changes that brought new and uncultivated people, even slaves, into wealth and position, maintained in them the ancient faiths upon which they relied as safeguards for their new possessions. But the active principle of their religion was fear, lest somehow harm come upon them from some unpropitiated source.

The confusion of a divided worship led to loss of clear vision of duty and to dissatisfaction of soul. The mean and unworthy character of the gods, which men had multiplied after the image of their own natures, brought disillusion to the thoughtful, and encouraged them in practical

[1] Dill, Roman Life, p. 384.

irreligion or atheism. Nothing was assured beyond the grave, and each chose the way by which he thought to get the most out of life. The gods themselves would not do otherwise. They even throve on lust and were honored in debauchery. The best men of Rome were impatient of divinities in whom they could not believe. The intelligent classes felt a contempt for the ever-present augurs and their oracles.[1] Lucretius declared that religion was the cause of all evils, but he gave man nothing to take its place. Cicero thought that the ancient faith should be preserved, as a necessity in governing the people, but he saw its doom impending. When emperors were apotheosized, and a man like Domitian spoke of himself in his decrees as "lord and god," worship could be nothing more than tradition, and piety was dead. Then men had recourse in their need to every superstition and religious nostrum of the world, — magic, soothsayers' arts, theosophy, and every foreign faith. Augustus consulted star-readers from the East, and Nero was a slave to superstition. The forum was crowded full of gods whom no one could respect or trust, and religion was as nearly snuffed out as a fundamental passion of the human heart can be. Tacitus

[1] Cicero, De Div., II, 24.

says the emperor Tiberius admitted that the remedy could be found, not in outer additions to the number of their gods, nor by the elaboration of ritual, nor through any outer mechanism, but only in the soul of man itself.

The Greek mind was more free to speculate than the Roman. The inheritance of the one had been a legacy of ideas, independent of a state they had not maintained; of the other a legacy of deeds intimately bound up with the state. The growing appreciation of personality for the individual and for God influenced the Greek toward the thought of an ordered universe. The Stoics standing on their one world-stuff debated with the Platonic dualists, and both made monotheism familiar, whether God were producing the world by his own self-evolution or creating it by his causal thought. There was much more culture of an intellectual sort among the Greeks than among the Romans. They were devoted to rhetoric and its practise in public speech, and provided the majority of teachers in the schools of Rome. There was little or no original thinking, but a constant drawing upon the ancient sources for material. In consequence, there was less of affirmation, and a tendency to rest content in old positions or to deny them altogether.

There was an ethical struggle against the evident decline in social life and in religion, and the issue was often carried to asceticism. This same trend affected theological thought to make it more monotheistic, and God was conceived as himself an ethical being. The popular mental exercise was metaphysical, and philosophy was current everywhere to a remarkable extent. Greek ethics rested on the reason, while Hebrew thinking derived its ethical sanction from revelation.

There was a general search for new religious values, and a certain expectancy of better things to come. While the Roman treated religion as a matter of the state, and had little sympathy with those who found the highest personal interest in it, the Greek had a keener perception of the inner worth of faith. He sought religion for itself rather than as a means to political ends. The Greek education, carried on in schools at Athens, Rome, Alexandria, and in all larger Greek and Roman cities, attracted multitudes, even from among the poor. Teachers were held in high regard and amassed fortunes by the practise of their profession.

Justin Martyr was willing to enroll at least two of the Greek philosophers, Heraclitus and Socrates, as Christians. Plato's doctrine of

ideas, among which the soul found a fitting home, and the ethical idealism which he taught, commended him to thoughtful Jews. His contrast between the ideal and the reality, and his insistence that man must conquer the world in himself, appealed to their way of thinking. Platonic ethics, founded upon the reason, and finding an intrinsic worth in goodness, did not seem so far away from the revealed ethics of the Law. Likewise Stoicism made its worth felt by those who had been reared in the Old Testament wisdom. They agreed with it that virtue or righteousness is itself the highest good, and that the only happy man is the righteous man. They too found in God a wise Providence, of perfect moral character, and in the soul a power of survival which death could not destroy. Alexandrian Judaism developed the Logos doctrine, of a spirit of wisdom with God, mediating for him the creative task, in which philosophical monism and Jewish theism seem to unite. Philo enthusiastically joined Greek philosophy and Hebrew theology, bridged the gulf between the Infinite and the world by his "Ideas," the chief of which were the angel guardians about the throne of God, and of these the greatest was the Logos.

Philo dipped his brush in every pigment,

Platonic, Stoic, Hebrew, and painted his pictures with the free hand of an impressionist. Man's soul was a prisoner in an evil body, joined to God by faith, and vision of him is the highest mortal experience. He insisted upon a deeper religious life than can be attained through formal offerings or keeping of the Law, and brought the warmth of the Greek spirit into the cold formalism of the Jewish faith, to vitalize it and lift the members of his race into the immediate presence and fellowship of God. No direct influence of Philo upon Jesus can be proved, or even thought of, but the service he rendered in preparing for the acceptance of the teachings of Christ at a later day requires that he be included in this discussion, and his work illustrates how intimately blended the thought-life of the day had come to be.

Out from the heart of such a civilization, in which the Roman was submerged in things and monopolized by the State, the Greek was seeking to adjust his old philosophies to new conditions, and the Jew was hiding his prophetic treasure in a priestly napkin, came forth Jesus Christ. He heard each voice as it spoke the message of the people to his eager heart, and in himself he gave the answer to them all; the Way for the Roman, the Truth for the Greek, the Life for the Jew.

CHAPTER IV

THE SOCIAL ATMOSPHERE INTO WHICH JESUS CAME

The social atmosphere of Palestine was controlled by three main influences, emanating from the education of Jewish youth, from political and religious parties, and from Greek and Roman thought and institutions in the land. But beneath all was the ever-present Messianism. It could not brook the cool, collected, and patient waiting for something cataclysmic to occur, which the Pharisee counseled, but felt impelled to move, and to originate the Kingdom and its better state so painfully delayed. The radicals always demand a chance to act. This element in the population had no taste for apocalypses and their idle, futile dreams. Carlyle's eternal conjugation of the verb To Do was more to its mind. Just as the more educated classes in Russia wait and hope and frown on revolution, passing good resolutions of loyalty in their meetings, and even in the Zemstvo, while the peasant, the ignorant man who was not so long ago a serf, will not wait, but demands ever more, and

enforces his demands by strikes, by forceful revolution, fire and blood; so there were two sections of society in those old days among the Jews. The lower, poorer party broke out now and then in action under some impromptu leader, who was quickly given his reward of martyrdom by the powers that be. There was less chance of success than there is for the muzhik, but the burning hope was in their hearts. That is one reason why the common people heard the words of Jesus gladly. He spoke of present relief, not of future glory, and he spoke directly to their hearts. Outbreaks of greater or lesser moment frequently occurred all down the years, from the Maccabees to the time of Christ. Pharisee and Zealot, each of these classes was stirred by the Messianic Hope, — but the one to sedition, the other to submission. The common people vented their impatience and asserted their religious zeal through these local and limited, but not infrequent, attempts, in ways inadequate and pathetically abortive, to realize something of their God-promised Hope. The other people, the thinking people, trained by the Pharisees, read and wrote apocalypses, which transported them from the evil present to the time when all would be well. They took a profane delight in calling down anathemas upon the heads of their enemies whom

they dared not touch, whom indeed they were assured they did not need to touch, for they must see to it only that they themselves were ready for the good gift when God gave it, which he surely would do soon. Lifted above the oppressive conditions of the poor, not constrained to rebellion by actual physical distress, they looked down upon the seditious acts of their poor neighbors with condemnation, as Josephus tells us now and then. Both inheritances from the ancient Hope must have affected the mind of Jesus, and made him more appreciative of the need, and more sympathetic with each, than either class could be with the other.

Education meant much to the Hebrew. It was a religious duty. The school was hard by or within the very walls of the synagogue. The earliest lessons of a child were given him from Deuteronomy (6: 4, 5; 7: 7). Scripture stories and selections from the poetry of the Psalms followed. David and Moses and the patriarchs, — all were made familiar to every child. From the age of six until twelve every boy was expected to attend the synagogue school and to recite his catechism on the Sabbath. Thus he became a "Son of the Commandment." But in the synagogue the Thorah was the real lesson book. "We take most pains of all," said Josephus,

"with the instruction of children, and esteem the observation of the laws and the piety corresponding with them the most important affair of our whole life." Josephus boasts of his own minute knowledge of the Law at the age of fourteen. Books of the Scriptures were frequently in possession of private individuals, and writing as well as reading was no rare accomplishment.[1] Occasionally a family owned, as a precious heirloom, a roll of the Law or the Prophets or of Psalmody, and used it for home reading with veneration.

There were three main parties developed in the chance of the religious situation, but one of these was so divided as to make practically four. These were the Pharisees, with their lesser division, or related group, the Essenes; the Zealots and the Sadducees. This last group was more political than religious, busying itself with the perquisites of ecclesiasticism and caring little for the faith. It was the aristocratic party, of little principle, with "laissez-faire" as its motto, courting the favor of the foreigner, and affecting all his culture. Of them there need be said no more, save that they had absolutely nothing in common with Jesus, and he finally died at their hands.

[1] Schürer.

The Pharisees were the religious people of the day. But their bent was scholastic rather than social, individualistic more than universal, legal and not definitely spiritual, because of this legalistic practise. Yet here if anywhere was the hope for Israel, and doubtless to this party, if to any, Jesus would belong. They had possession of the schools, and ruled the synagogues, which were their refuge over against the Sadducean perversion of the temple. They held that the Jews were a peculiar possession of God, and that they in turn possessed him uniquely as their King. The "Shemoneh Esreh," recited daily by the faithful, includes these words: "Be King over us, Thou alone, O God." It was the duty of the people to drive out the Roman when they could. The Gentile had a right for a time to rule, but the time was short. A universal kingdom would soon come, in which the tables would be turned, and the Hebrew would administer affairs under guidance of a King to come from the skies to supernatural power and authority. A judgment would precede, like that which John preached. Once more would the Gentiles make assault upon the Messiah, but in vain, for they would be surely overthrown forever.

The Essenes were not a distinct party, but a

purist sect of the Pharisees. They formed a monastic brotherhood, and their name probably means The Pious. They wore white garments, they made a cult of ceremonial purity and went about ministering to the poor and sick and needy. They were extremely liberal in their attitude toward the Law and the ritual of the temple. Their legalism was of another sort. They prayed at dawn for the coming of the Judge, and regarded the glory of the setting sun with awe as typical of paradise for which they strove. They had many customs, like their grouping of teacher and disciples, their common purse, their common religious meal, their abounding service to the sick, which Jesus afterward practised with his followers. If they did not influence him in these externals, and they were themselves influenced by Greek thought through the neighboring cities of Decapolis or the Therapeutæ of Alexandria, then Jesus himself may have come more or less under these same Greek influences also. But the spirit and tendency of the Essenes were far from being in harmony with Jesus. They separated themselves from the world, to live in some chapter-house in town or country, on the ground that contact with life was contaminating. Refuges and monasteries in the desert were their final habitation. Their spirit

was overmastered and smothered by their cult of purity.

The Zealots, as their name implies, were the party of action, the opportunists who sought continually for a chance by force to bring about a better state of things and liberate the nation from a galling yoke. They were well watched, and their numbers were never very large. They are more important as representing an element in the national status than for anything they did. They appeared at an attempt to tax the people when Judea became a Roman province in 6 A.D. under a procurator. Then came forth one Judas of Gaulonitis, a Galilean, according to Josephus (War II, 8: 1. Ant. 8: 1, 6), who organized this party of revolt against the foreign power (Ant. xviii: 1; 1, 6). A strong socialistic spirit of the masses against the classes characterized all the history of the party. They burned the houses of the rich, even the archives of the state, and tried to destroy all evidence of debt, that they might start anew. They caused the death of many men of wealth, and several high priests. They were a sort of religious nihilists, and the idealism of the members naturally oozed away, although they insisted upon their party cries of "No King but God," and "A new and worthy state," with the prophets for their comforters and guides.

John the Baptist may possibly have been an inconsistent Essene, reacting against the extremes of his party, and preaching independently the message given him, of the Kingdom near at hand and repentance that must prepare for it. A popular preacher in the neighborhood of Nazareth, even if he were not a relative, as the Gospels of the infancy declare, nor an acquaintance, as the Fourth Gospel implies, John surely would attract Jesus to his mission on the banks of the Jordan among the crowds which flocked from every side to hear his prophet's cry.

One other influence could not fail to reach even up to Nazareth among the hills, and must have stared in the face every pious Jew whenever he went down to his annual feasts in Jerusalem. The foreigner was in power everywhere. The usurper had erected his fortresses in every commanding spot, and even overtowered the temple on its sacred hill. The Greek culture was maintained in all the cities, and the men of affairs dealt with Greeks and Romans more than with Jews in foreign trade. Hellenist influences pervaded the country. Greek was spoken in every place where foreigners gathered, and every coin that passed a Hebrew hand — denarius, drachma, talanton — was marked in Greek letters, until every intelligent man knew something of the language

spoken by all foreign Jews so familiarly when they came home to attend the festivals of their religion. The name of their Supreme Council, and frequently that of the High Priest, was Greek. The touch of Hellenic culture was a broadening influence which no mind alert and open could have failed to feel and gather up for future use. Those Greeks who sought Jesus at the feast may not have needed the Greek-named disciples, Andrew and Philip, to act as interpreters for them when they wanted to hold speech with him.[1]

The Greek cities in Palestine were administered according to Greek ideas, through magistrates and senates, as independent commonwealths. Herod and others after him also built towns here and there inhabited by Gentiles, like Sebaste, Cæsarea, Gaba in Galilee, and Esbonitis in Perea. These were Herod's outer defenses, and centers of Greek influence over the people. Even in Jerusalem he built a theater and amphitheater. All this emphasized the hatred for the Gentile in the Jewish heart, while it gradually and inevitably altered opinion and made familiar what was once repulsive. The rabbis laid down the law, but convenience, necessity, and time became a sterner law to break down their barriers. The Jew might avoid the Greek cities as plague-spots, but he could not

[1] John 12: 20 ff.

shut out a certain atmosphere which came in on every breeze that blew from Alexandria, where so many Jews were congregated, nor could the influence of theaters, statues, and paintings be altogether withstood, even while they were an abomination in Jewish eyes. The Greek language was spoken upon the streets of every Jewish town of any size, and more or less of contact with Greeks and Romans in trade was unavoidable. The Septuagint was the version of the Old Testament generally in use, if we may judge from the quotations found in the New Testament. It was alike more common, cheaper to buy, and even more easily understood than the ancient Hebrew version. In the court of the Gentiles in the temple at Jerusalem, upon the well-wrought marble screen which ran across the court, a sign was placed in both Latin and Greek, instructing strangers concerning the proprieties of the place. There were many Greek words, especially those connected with trade, which crept into the Aramaic dialect. The Hebrew had no term corresponding to many philosophical ideas, nor even to the word φιλοσοφία itself. When words were naturalized among them, ideas could not remain outside.

It was a period of literary activity. Lost works by Jason of Cyrene, the Stoic philosopher

Poseidonius, by Assinios Polio, Strabo, Hipsycrates, Dellius, Ptolemaus, Nicolaus of Damascus, who was a friend of Herod's and an Aristotelian who wrote much, especially in history, — lost books by all of these appeared about this time. Justus of Tiberias, a Jew who had imbibed Greek culture like Josephus, wrote works which it would be a great help for us to know.

Philo, son of a wealthy Jewish merchant in Alexandria, was born a score of years before Jesus, in the center of the Jewish world in fact, as Jerusalem was the center in ideal. He combined the Platonic ideas of God as transcendent, with the Stoic ideas of immanence, "the One and the All," and tried to lead the Greek and Roman world across the bridge thus formed into the heart of the Hebrew Scriptures. His influence upon his own people was probably stronger than that upon the outside world, and centuries of Christian development were largely tinctured by his thought and method of interpretation.

Josephus, born in Jerusalem fifty or sixty years later, of a priestly race, and carefully educated according to the standard of the Jews, was himself at fourteen an instructor in the Law. At sixteen he went into the schools of the Pharisees, Sadducees and Essenes, and then withdrew

for three years to the desert for meditation and the hermit life. At twenty-six he went to Rome and gained the favor of the empress, through whom he found the way to riches. Drawn into the war of 66, he became a commander of Galilee. Later on he wrote his Apologia in Rome, where he was a favorite, and took the family name of Vespasian, Flavius. He wrote the Jewish War in seven books, probably at command of Titus. The Antiquities were in twenty books, and narrated the history of the Jews down to 66 A.D., for Greek and Roman readers, that he might commend his people to their favor. Of the period 4 B.C. to 41 A.D. he knew but little. His work Contra Appian is an apology for his people and his faith. In it he slights the Messianic Hope, perhaps because it had been a cause of uprisings against Rome.

Jesus, then, was born into a home of synagogue-bred Pharisaism, where he was trained in all that made a pious, law-abiding Jew. He was given a chance for education in the Thorah, in reading and writing, at least, and he may have caught a smattering of Greek.

Three great roads within sight of the hilltops about his home were channels of all the life and motion of the stream of the world's interests. Opposite to the place where Jesus often climbed,

he saw the Jerusalem highway with its annual throng of pilgrims, and the merchants going up and down from Egypt. Damascus sent her caravans across the hill on which he stood. The highway between Acre and Decapolis was not far away, with its soldiery and royalty, its travel of wealth and a display which could not fail to attract the eye of a village lad at play, whose imagination never slept. From childhood he grew up with knowledge of the foreigner and his wealth and power. Even as a boy he was in some slight touch with the great, busy, teeming world.[1]

Religiously, he felt the impact of two Messianic movements alive and active among the people. One was ignorant, spasmodic, violent, badly led and unorganized. The other was carefully systematized, had a large and growing literature, and held to inaction under the law as the only possible duty, while the will of God required them to wait until his times were ripe, a crisis which could not long be postponed. A thoughtful youth would ponder these things, and develop his own ideas. One who loved the companionship of nature would think them out alone with God beneath the Syrian stars or on the hilltops where his country spread far and wide before

[1] George Adam Smith, Historical Geography, pp. 433–4.

him, and all her history lay open to his eye like a book. The movements of the poor, unshepherded people would move his sensitive soul and fill it with yearnings unutterable. The policy of helpless waiting for God to act, putting off all initiative upon him, would stir the blood of an earnest patriot. Thus Jesus grew and ripened in his mind, and developed purposes and dreamed dreams, and was prepared for the coming of a great experience to his soul in the preaching of John the Baptist.

PART II

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE SELF-CONSCIOUSNESS OF JESUS

CHAPTER V

THE YOUTH OF JESUS

The birth of Jesus has been surrounded for centuries by the most natural and fitting halo of mystery and poetic imagination. No event in history invites the dreaming fancy or the interpreting thought of the ages as this one of the birth of a child who in his life and death revealed to mankind more of the true nature of God and man than all other persons or things have ever done. When those who believed in him began to organize their faith and to proclaim the gospel he had committed to their care, their hearts were filled with a great affection, and their minds with the overpowering truths of the incarnation, as they had learned them from their Master in life and in death. For he being dead yet spake to them, in those fresh revelations and heartening experiences by which they were assured of his resurrection and his presence with them forever in the spirit.

Up to the death of Jesus his disciples thought of him as a man like themselves, only grown to a

nobler stature. Even when confessing their highest faith in him, they dared to rebuke him for what they regarded as errors in his judgment or lapses in his spirit (Matt. 16: 22). They never looked upon him as in any sensuous fashion apart from themselves, but rather they became attached to him by the closest human ties, and went about with him as the followers and friends of any rabbi might attend him, only with far more personal attachment and devotion.

The oldest of the Gospels, St. Mark, gives us no hint of any other than a natural birth of Jesus, but speaks of his family and his home in Nazareth in a way to preclude any current knowledge of his having been miraculously born. On the contrary, there was a plainly marked tradition that he was born of the lineage of David on his father's side, and this tradition appears in each of the Gospels, even in the genealogies of the first and third. As late as when John 6: 42 was written, the author did not hesitate to put into the lips of the people such confident words as these: "Is not this Jesus, the son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know?"

The earliest testimony regarding Jesus comes to us from St. Paul. In Romans 1: 3, 4, he wrote of Jesus, "Born of the seed of David according to the flesh, who was declared to be the

Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead." Again (Romans 9: 5) Christ is of the Israelites, like the fathers, "as concerning the flesh." In all the strength of his desire to elevate Christ and set him high upon the throne of power, surely Paul would have used any story of a supernatural birth that he might hear from the disciples with whom he associated. In Gal. 4: 4 he writes again of Jesus as "Born of a woman, born under the law," — expressions which would hardly have been used if Paul had heard of a supernatural birth.

Even where the fact of the virgin birth would have added greatest weight to argument, in the Acts, as in 3: 22 ff. and 10: 37 ff., no mention whatever is made of it. The argument from silence is never a wholly satisfactory one, but if it ever serves, it does here, especially when in the instances alluded to it is confirmed by the utter silence of Jesus himself upon the subject of his birth. Had he been conscious of such a miraculous origin, how could he have been afflicted with temptations, or overborne by sorrows, or cast down by the thickening of the fogs about his path? How could he have failed to establish his Sonship, both for his own peace of mind and as an unanswerable argument against his

enemies, by allusion to the one event against which no mind in that day would have held out? In accordance with what I take to be the widest and earliest tradition, then, I assume that Jesus was born of a mother named Mary, in the home of Joseph the carpenter of Nazareth, his father, who died while Jesus was still young. It was not unlike similar homes that stand to-day, along the rambling streets of Syrian towns, of one or two rooms; low and meanly furnished, wherein all the household arts are practised and all the family live together, with little privacy and no comfort. The boys all learned a trade, and in the school which in the days of Jesus was placed hard by the synagogue, they learned to read and to familiarize themselves with certain portions of the Scriptures. In the synagogue they gathered on the Sabbath week after week and heard the Law and the Prophets read from the rolls kept in the sacred chest and handed out to the leading men or chance visitors from abroad that they might read the lesson of the day.

The village of Nazareth is situated in its deep and quiet valley among the ridges above Jezreel, and commands a noble view from the height of land behind the town. Far to the north rise the snowy peaks of Hermon, and Tabor opposite guards the fertile Jordan valley below. West-

ward stands the long and forest-covered reach of Carmel, stretching away to the sea, and below it lies the fertile valley, as rich in historic associations to a Jewish child as in its fields of grain and its olive trees. "You see thirty miles in three directions."[1] The great road to Jerusalem and Egypt lay opposite across the valley. A journey of three hours brought one to the rich and populous city of Sepphoris. The princely Roman residence stood beside the blue sea of Galilee about a half day's walk from Nazareth. The most flourishing Roman port of entry was twenty miles away. But to reach the holy city, Jerusalem, one must travel for three days. Nazareth had doubtless as many inhabitants as now, which number five or six thousand. It appears to have been regarded with disfavor, almost with scorn, although no reason can be found for such a prejudice.

In this quiet corner of Galilee Jesus grew, familiar with the stress of poverty and the grind of toil, and developed by hard work in physical strength and health. His parents took the poor man's gift to offer in the temple when in pious fashion they brought their baby boy to be consecrated and set apart as a member of the Hebrew

[1] George Adam Smith, the Historical Geography of the Holy Land, p. 433.

race. They were poor, but they bore the lineage of kings. The family tradition held fast to the records handed down from of old to prove that in Joseph's veins flowed the blood of David's line. Jesus had brothers and sisters, and with them he, perhaps the eldest, worked to help his father, and later to keep his mother from the too heavy burdens of a large and dependent family. The discipline of regular toil, of bearing burdens, of sacrifice for others, was his in fullest measure.

"Heaven lies about us in our infancy," Wordsworth says. But he suggests that it is soon lost in the growing boy, and earthly experiences take its place. How much of heaven did Jesus retain, and did he ever lose the consciousness of heaven as the birthplace of his soul? Surely we are dealing with a genuine boy as we seek to trace the growth of this child of Nazareth, but unfortunately we are compelled to reconstruct his experiences and character from the history of the man, itself all too brief. He must have based his later consciousness of Messiahship upon a strong and normal self-consciousness, or, as Beyschlag has pointed out, he would have adopted the current Messianic conceptions of his age.

Education is learning to fear aright, the Greek philosopher maintained. It was during these

youthful days that Jesus learned what to fear and what to trust. His home life must have taught him the confidence of love, and given him a concept of fatherhood which made the fear of God no terror-stirring sentiment in his breast, for he early learned to call God Father. Idealized and monopolized by the exigencies of the great spiritual need in those who were denied an entrance through a human Christ to the human heart of God, the character of Mary, his mother, has been set before the world as the embodiment of gentle and noble womanhood. The few allusions to her in the Gospels suggest that Jesus did not inherit qualities from her which in any way hindered the growth in him of love and the perfecting of the law of kindness in his heart. Sons naturally inherit from the mother in their make-up, and in this ideal maternity the law was not broken.

The first evidence we have of growing character in Jesus is in Luke 2: 40: "And the child grew, and waxed strong, becoming full of wisdom: and the grace of God was upon him." Although a part of the disputed Gospel of the infancy, the fact of its naturalness leads me to use the passage. It is similar in its first statement to that concerning John the Baptist in the preceding chapter. In fact, the phrase ἐν τῷ πνεύματι

is added there, which is not weaker than the πληρούμενον σοφίᾳ here. We are told that he developed like other children, and that he learned by degrees not only the common things of life, but, to take the σοφία in its Hebrew sense, the fear of God and the high things of religion. There is a suggestion of a spirit open to good, seeking after light and truth, of a child-nature simple and pure, of which it can be said "the grace of God was upon him" as we speak of such a child to-day.

We know something of the character of the brother of Jesus, James the pillar apostle of the church in Jerusalem, and we can infer from his more commonplace mind of what sort the training was to which both were subject in their home in Nazareth. James was an orthodox Jew, of the strictest sect of the Pharisees, punctilious and formal. He had been taught from the Thorah in the synagogue school. Writing as well as reading was not beyond the reach of these village boys. It was possible to read in private also the manuscripts to which they listened at the public services of the synagogue. Thus the law and the prophets were more or less familiar to these boys in Nazareth. One with the eager mind of Jesus must have been peculiarly attracted to these ancient documents of the faith of his

fathers, and every occasion to listen or to study must have been improved by him.

In addition to Law and Prophets, he surely breathed the atmosphere of the Book of Daniel, with its mysterious symbolism and its striking stories. What child could resist it? What earnest soul at that time could fail to revel in the rewards that came to the young princes of his own blood in their heroic ventures for their religion and their God? Through that door Jesus entered the region of apocalyptic, in which his people for five generations had found their highest encouragement. By it they expressed their loftiest hopes, and they maintained intact all that was left to them of the old sense of a living inspiration and a future realization of all that the past had promised but not fulfilled. There the Messianic vision was forever changing, forever growing, in its content, and yet never fixing upon any definite and settled form.

Messianism was in full possession of the mind of the Pharisaic element when Jesus was a schoolboy in Nazareth. The Pharisees had control of the schools and synagogues, and the children were instructed in their way. They were patriots, and they felt themselves the only representatives of the true faith in the midst of a crooked and time-serving generation. The

prayer they taught every child and expected every pious Jew to say thrice each day reveals what may have fallen very often from the lips of Jesus. We have it in the form given to it before 110 A.D., under the title "Shemoneh Esreh" or "Eighteen Supplications." One more has been added since the name was given to the prayer. A few of the petitions are as follows:[1]

Blessed art thou, O Lord, our God and the God of our fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, the God of Jacob, the great God, the mighty and tremendous, the Most High God, who bestowest gracious favors and createst all things, and rememberest the piety of the patriarchs, and wilt bring a redeemer to their posterity, for the sake of Thy name in love. O King, who bringest help and healing and art a shield. Blessed art thou, O Lord, the shield of Abraham.

Thou art mighty forever, O Lord; Thou restorest life to the dead, Thou art mighty to save; who sustainest the living with beneficence, quickenest the dead with great mercy, supporting the fallen and healing the sick, and setting at liberty those who are bound, and upholding Thy faithfulness unto those who sleep in the dust. Who is like unto Thee, Lord, the Almighty One; or who can be compared unto Thee, O King, who killest and makest alive

[1] The Jewish people in the Times of Jesus Christ, Schürer, Div. II, Vol. II, p. 85 ff.

again, and causest help to spring forth? And faithful art Thou to quicken the dead. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, who restorest the dead.

Sound with the great trumpet to announce our freedom; and set up a standard to collect our captives, and gather us together from the four corners of the earth. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, who gatherest the outcasts of Thy people Israel.

O restore our judges as formerly, and our counsellors as at the beginning; and remove from us sorrow and sighing; and reign over us, Thou O Lord alone, in grace and mercy; and justify us. Blessed art Thou, O Lord the King, for Thou lovest Righteousness and justice.

The offspring of David Thy servant speedily cause to flourish, and let his horn be exalted in Thy salvation; for Thy salvation do we hope daily. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, who causest the horn of salvation to flourish.

We praise Thee, for Thou art the Lord our God and the God of our fathers for ever and ever; the Rock of our life, the Shield of our salvation, Thou art for ever and ever. We will render thanks unto Thee, and declare Thy praise, for our lives which are delivered into Thy hand, and for our souls which are deposited with Thee, and for Thy miracles which daily are with us; and for Thy wonders and Thy goodness, which are at all times, evening and morning and at noon. Thou art good, for Thy mercies fail not, and compassionate, for Thy loving-kindness never ceaseth; our hopes are for ever in Thee. And for all this praised and extolled be thy Name,

our King, for ever and ever. And all that live shall give thanks unto Thee for ever, Selah, and shall praise Thy name in truth; the God of our salvation and our aid for ever. Selah. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, for all-bountiful is Thy name, and unto thee it becometh us to give thanks.

Great salvation bring over Israel Thy people for ever, for Thou art King, Lord of all salvation. Praised be Thou, Lord, for Thou blessest Thy people Israel with salvation.

Jesus probably did not read any of the Apocalyptic Books, but he heard these things discussed in the gatherings of the pious leaders of the synagogue, or in Jerusalem. The literature of the New Testament is permeated with them. Charles has discovered about one hundred passages where the New Testament reminds him of the book of Enoch alone. The words attributed to Jesus in the Gospels are by no means foreign to the apocalyptic thought and utterance, as where he speaks of final judgment, the woes to come, the coming of the Son of man, rewards and punishment, evil spirits, angels.

This is the atmosphere in which the young man of Nazareth grew. How much of the teaching of the synagogue and school and current discussion did he absorb and accept without a question? That we cannot tell, but it seems probable that all the mere furniture of thought-

forms and current ideas concerning theology on its speculative side were adopted by him naturally, while he changed the content of every form and filled with new meaning all the ideas so commonly handled about him. Nothing essential did he accept, we may be certain, merely because it was so taught. From the beginning, this child, who grew into a man of such extraordinary insight and strength of mind, must have found the well of pure religious feeling in himself so copious and so refreshing that the flow of it outward met and overmatched the inward currents of ideas and forms of thought. He took out of the teaching of home and school what he could appropriate, and left the rest, as every child does, but what he took was, we can conceive, the spiritual and the eternal, while the temporary and peculiar was adopted only as a vehicle for service, not as a fixed standard of truth.

The Gospels tell us of his journey with his parents to Jerusalem at his twelfth year, to become a citizen and to take his place in the religious system of his race. There is no reason for rejecting the tradition in all its beauty and natural simplicity. Jesus was an adolescent, and the eager curiosity of that period, and its love of argument, were his. The boy was so

enamored of the temple and the atmosphere of religion, and a mighty interest in spiritual things so possessed his mind, that he forgot his duty to his parents and the time appointed for return to Nazareth. With unfailing energy, the magnet of his people's religious center held him fast, and for many hours, all day long, he listened to the men who discussed the Scriptures and expounded the Law, and asked them questions which they may have found it difficult to answer in the way of their profession. In their turn they questioned him, and "all that heard him were astonished at his understanding and answers." His parents were naturally amazed, for how could they know that a son of theirs would dare to sit among the rabbis and actually discuss their sacred books, which it was for them to obey without a word? And when the mother-heart, both apologetic to the learned men and mindful of her own great anxiety, spoke a word of chiding to her son, he made answer out of his new world of thought and satisfied religious sentiment, as if in greatest surprise that they did not realize that there was only one place in all the world where they might have known he would be, engrossed in the things of his Father, — in his Father's house. They did not understand what he meant by calling God his Father

in this intimate, personal fashion. They had not realized until now how deep was the religious life that they had fostered in their son. With them he had not had much speech about these high things. Their simple minds and the parental range of topics had precluded that. From this time forward a new interest in the sacred books was doubtless apparent in Jesus, and while he went down with them from the temple, "and came to Nazareth, and was subject unto them, and increased in wisdom and stature, and in favor with God and man," there was something different in the boy from that day. The normal, universal change which we call conversion had come to him,[1] and with fullest effect because it was in no way hampered or resisted. His parents watched him with a growing awe, and into their love for him a new tenderness came, as he discharged so perfectly the household duties which fell to his hand. Their dreams of the future took on shapes of large place and influential leadership, no doubt, for their thoughtful boy who was so full of the sense of God, and who entered with such earnest-

[1] "Religion has no other function than to make this change complete, and the whole of morality may be well defined as life in the interest of the race, for love of God and love of man are one and inseparable." HALL, *Adolescence*, Vol. II, p. 304.

ness into every religious service. How should he be educated? How could they train him for a learned profession? When Joseph died and left the burden of support of the family upon Mary and Jesus, the possibility of such a course was removed, and Mary must have resigned herself to the thought that her son could never be more than her husband had been, a worker in wood in their own quiet village. But Jesus, growing into young manhood, fulfilled every duty and absorbed all goodness presented to him, shaped his thoughts and broadened his sympathies, and gave himself in his quiet life to meditation and prayer, to the discipline of service and the weighing of truth as he found it. It never served to detract from his perfect relation to his Father when Jesus found that things were hidden from his ken. Rather in the exercise of faith did he prove the perfection of the relation he professed.

Jesus may be styled with justice the typical adolescent. His pure race-inheritance and his simple life assured to him a probable period of growth slow enough and long enough to attain to all his powers of body and of mind without stunting or premature development. He had time to gain a full, well-rounded individuation. The physical passions, held in check, transferred their forces to the growth of soul within him; and

his psychic life was enriched by the freedom he enjoyed from all false and exhausting stimulation of the nerves through the senses.[1]

No sympathetic modern student can accept the conceptions of medieval or even of most modern art as to the physical appearance of Jesus. He was a workman, and had a workman's body, large and strong. He was a leader of men, not an ascetic nor an apologetic weakling. He appealed to men and women, both, with power. He could not have been an effeminate person, but must have had elements of manly beauty, in spite of the inferences often improperly drawn from the prophetic words regarding Israel in Isaiah (53: 2). If he was "a man of sorrows" it was because he ministered to sorrow everywhere the antidote of a joyous, sunny nature that dwelt in serenity and exalted peace. His will was strong, compelling men and shaping circumstances. He had that lavishness of sense which implies great capacity for pleasure or for pain, for joy or for sorrow, with the eager spontaneity of thought which belongs to such a nature.

[1] "True religion is normally the slowest because the most comprehensive kind of growth, and the entire ephebic decade is not too long and is well spent if altruism or love of all that is divine and human comes to assured supremacy over self before it is ended. Later adolescence merges the lower into the higher social self." — HALL, *Adolescence*, Vol. II, p. 304.

This afforded him quick sympathies, ready insight, and power to teach and lead.

Two influences were always strong in shaping the character of the Nazarene. He had a devoted mother, to whom he held the closest relation even to the end. She was a deeply religious and mystical nature, cherishing in her heart all that occurred of unusual significance in the history of her boy (Luke 2: 51). John Milton assumes to interpret her influence as remembered by her son:

> "These growing thoughts my mother soon perceiving
> By words at times cast forth, inward rejoiced,
> And said to me apart, 'High are thy thoughts,
> O son: but nourish them and let them soar
> To what height sacred virtue and true worth
> Can raise them, though above example high.'"

The feminine virtues of patience and steadfast endurance she instilled into his mind, with the grace of gentleness and the active principle of love. The habit of prayer and the household faith and knowledge of the Law doubtless grew up about her centralizing and inspiring presence. Boys should normally inherit from their mothers. Consciousness of the fact has had something to do with the reverence paid to Mary by the ages of Christian practise and Christian aspiration.

Another formative influence in the shaping of

the character of Jesus lay in nature, spread about him everywhere where the hand of man had not covered it deep with his contrivances. The Hebrew mind was peculiarly susceptible to nature. The Psalms are almost like a collection of nature songs and hymns and lyrics. All that is majestic in mountain, sea and forest, in the deep and populous skies and the majestic storm, in sun and star, in light and darkness,—all finds an appreciation in the Psalms. Job revels in the larger aspects of it. Jerusalem is praised for the beauty of her situation, the joy of the whole earth, with the mountains round about her. Nazareth, itself probably not preeminent for beauty, lay in a region of fertile fields and sunny hills, of varied landscape and far glimpses of mountains and plains and the valley of the Jordan. Every sensitive soul, awake to the voices of the spirit, knows how full of significance all nature is. In silence the soul drinks it in, and alone upon the hilltops or basking in the sun, long dreams come flocking to the growing boy upon which his imagination feeds. He gains the power of sympathy with nature where there is nothing that can come between him and its fresh, close touch, until he comes by a sort of absorption to know her secrets and to be confident in her presence and to be refreshed by her

strong grasp. In those days of his early youth Jesus learned the way to nature, and began that communion which becomes one of the greatest comforts to the weary heart and the doorway into the upper rooms of life where God sits serene and approachable, whatever may occur below and without. Jesus traveled that road frequently throughout the close, crowded days of his active ministry, and gathered to his soul refreshment in the fields where he walked alone with God, or on the mountainsides in prayer. He must have known for a long time

> "The ancient teachers never dumb
> Of Nature's unhoused lyceum."
>
> "Himself to Nature's heart so near,
> That all her voices in his ear
> Of beast or bird had meanings clear."

The influence of nature upon all religious souls is deep and constant. Not only to get away from men, but also to be in touch with the living cloak of the earth which seems to lie close about God, the "religious" have been inclined to live apart in country places and usually amid great beauty or under the spell of vastness and grandeur, by the sea or among desert sands or in the mountains. Amos, the prophet, brought something of the spirit of the landscape and its

effect upon his soul to Bethel when he made his solemn protest against the royal luxury and the license of them that forget God. Nature pictures stand out like illustrations all through his prophecies. Elijah found his home on Carmel, whose rugged rocks comport with his character. Ezekiel owes much to the river Chebar by which he dwelt, and the psalmists reveled in nature's every mood.

The baptism of Jesus by John the Baptist was a crisis in his life second to none hitherto. His yearning spirit, searching everywhere for food, assimilating all that came to him of nourishment wherever found, rejecting whatever was not according to experience, and using with perfect freedom all that might serve as a temporary vehicle of thought or emotion, went out to the various teachers and preachers who came into Galilee or whom he found in his annual visits at the time of feasts in Jerusalem. Little did he find that was new or stimulating in them or their message. It was without authority, hollow, dry and formal. He gives evidence of some communication with the Essenes, as with the Pharisees, but the one as much as the other missed the real content of life, and failed to stir his soul.

In his constant spiritual alertness, the teaching of John the Baptist drew him to the great preacher

of repentance by the Jordan. How long he listened to him, what relations were established between them of sympathy or possibly of blood, as the tradition brought down to us in the Fourth Gospel suggests, we can never know. There is evidence of acquaintance given in the description of the act when he too was baptized and took up as his own the message of repentance. Here was one soul that spoke from deeper human needs than the scribes. Here was one who understood him better than any one else had ever done. The realities of life were spiritual to him also. They found so much in common that it became a question with John whether his disciple was not rather his master. Jesus gave himself to the cult unreservedly, however, and insisted that he should be baptized by John as every other convinced follower was. It was his opportunity, long awaited, to attach himself to an active movement and make known the purpose long ripening in his heart, to serve the nation and the world. His family did not suspect his high calling, and later even tried to dissuade him from it; but it was the beginning of life to him, after a long preparation (Mark 3: 21, 31).

What the rite of baptism meant to him can be understood only as we learn what it meant to the average Jew, and then judge what it must mean

to one so full of the spirit of life as Jesus was. Baptism was no new rite among his people. The purifying bath of the entire body in a running stream, or at least in cold water, was the recognized form for ending ceremonial uncleanness.[1] This symbolic action had become in itself of value as a restoration to covenant rights. The proselyte had to submit to baptism as a condition of Jewish recognition. The Pharisees, in accordance with their common way of treating the Law, had accommodated the symbol and reduced it to a pouring of water over the hands before eating.[2] The general significance of baptism was one of ceremonial purification, and full or fresh participation in the covenant relations of Israel with God. It was a symbol used even with dishes and furniture (Mark 7: 4), and was exceedingly common to the Jew.

John the Baptist evidently was not content with the hollow form of baptism. He meant something more by it than ceremonial cleansing from any possible stain of touch or forbidden association according to the Law. He meant an inner purification, a change of spirit, a renewal of relations with God in the very heart of man. Only he who wanted that and would agree to

[1] Num. 19: 11ff.; 31: 19; Isa. 1: 16; Zech. 13: 1 and Ezek. 36: 25ff.

[2] Mark. 7: 3; Luke 11: 38.

seek for it was welcomed to his baptism. The rite of John looked backward to an unworthy past. The emphasis he put upon repentance as its prime condition met the needs of every sinful soul. Did it meet the need of Jesus? Was he too needing to repent? Or did he submit himself as one who welcomed any spiritual propaganda, who saw in John and his message the very voice he had been longing for? Jesus surely, if he was the youth we have described, had no need of repentance. He attached himself to John irresistibly, inevitably, as to the one lofty and effective spiritual cause among the people. If he had already in his heart a great desire to tell men what he had found in his personal experience with God, as he surely must have had, then John became to him the sure and necessary preparer of his way, to fit men everywhere to hear his message of a life of sonship to God, and baptism was the significant door of entrance into the new relation. With unerring judgment Jesus made himself a part of the current popular movement, and in no great humility, but rather in deepest devotion and with lofty enthusiasm, he entered into the waters and received baptism at the hands of John. But that very act decided him that he could never adopt such a symbol as his own peculiar deed. He never himself baptized. The

rite he did adopt, to be administered by others, not by himself, lest he seem to be another John and his mission that of a prophet, marking all with his own peculiar ceremony. He took the rite and universalized it, as he did so many other formal acts, and gave it to his disciples for its spiritual, not its ceremonial, significance. He added to it elements that lifted it out of the place to which John had elevated it, and made Christian baptism significant of a process of the Holy Spirit. That fact has its bearings upon the question what it meant for Jesus to be baptized by John. With him it looked forward rather than backward, upward rather than downward, and away from self to God.

This act of Jesus was not taken without contemplation. He made it a step toward larger things beyond. Did he remember that consecration to the kingly office was effected by his people with the baptismal act (1 Sam. 16: 13), and through it gather to himself new power in a deeper consciousness that he was the Son of God? He did not mean to join himself to John as a follower of his. They had doubtless talked of that before, and John was reconciled to have this man, whom he felt to be so much more truly fitted for service to the nation than he could be, increase while he decreased. He gave his dis-

ciples up to him when they were ready for the higher leadership, and only kept about him those for whom his message seemed better adapted as a preparation for the fuller gospel of his friend. But even he was not prepared for the exaltation in which Jesus received the rite. The novitiate was taken out of himself, and wrapt in vision which he afterward described as seeing heaven opened and hearing a voice calling him the beloved Son of God. At the same time Jesus saw in his vision as it were a dove bearing the gift of the Holy Spirit of God, to rest upon him forevermore. Many great men have had these intense psychoses at times of unusual excitement. Evidently the consecration of his future life was involved in that ceremony of his baptism, and increased its significance mightily to him. He did not tell his disciples about his visions in order to gain authority over them, but only in the intimate sharing with them of his deepest experiences.

Mark had a more subtle understanding of the growth of the self-consciousness of Jesus than the early Church in the dogmatic stress of reflection could acquire. Mark was right in discovering the beginning of the Messiahship of Jesus at the baptism, rather than at the ascension where the writer of Acts (2: 36) conceives it to originate.

Jesus knew himself from this time on, not in ecstatic rapture, but in sound, sane ways, and in profound conviction, as the Son of God, par excellence. Here was the turning-point of his life. A new field, untried, untrodden by any other foot, as much beyond that in which John had done so much to arouse the people as John was above all other voices of the day, awaited him, and he faced it alone with God. Is it strange that he saw visions and showed himself exalted in his spirit? Thus he passed on from John, led by forces stronger than himself, up to the wilderness, to meet and wrestle with the pressing practical questions of his future way.

These are the materials for growth which the mind and spirit of Jesus found, and which served to feed his soul with the ideals of the Messianic office. He did not reach his consciousness of the call of God by pure thinking, nor did he search out the Old Testament ideals and adjust his life to them. Had he tried to reason out the matter in logical course, he would have adopted totally different methods, and the result would have been a repetition of the failures that are forgotten. Logic told him that he was not, and could never be, the Messiah, nor anything more than a religious reformer like John. His

faith in his mission sprang from deeper depths, and was the very current of his life.[1] It was faith in himself and in God. He himself must unfold as God gave him opportunity; and in perfect confidence, seeing only a little way ahead, he entered upon his career.

[1] Matt. 11: 28ff.; 12: 28; Mark 1: 10; 3: 27; Luke 4: 18ff.; 10: 18f; 11: 20; 12: 10.

CHAPTER VI

THE TEMPTATION

WHATEVER his preparation had been for the Messianic rôle when he came to the baptism of John, one thing Jesus did not once think to realize, and that was the common conception of an apocalyptic Messiah. His studies of Scripture, his discussion of the current Pharisaic ideal, must have led him to formulate definite ideas about that. His entire temper of mind and his attitude toward life determined his course with reference to the more violent and drastic phases of that popular dream. He surely did have at some time a definite belief in his Messianic mission; even students of the school of Strauss and Renan agree that this is indisputable. He called men to share with him a new ethico-religious sonship to God, and that call on Jewish lips involved a Messianic consciousness. His office he recognized, expanded, and exalted, or the entire gospel story is misleading.

The Temptation is typical of experiences which must have extended through weeks and months

when he was facing the question of the formulation of his ideals and the adoption of methods for realizing them. He must have come to the conviction, long before, that he was a chosen messenger of God, and in subjecting himself to the baptism of John he became convinced that he was the true Messiah. The familiar symbols of the dove and the voice, more familiar to a Jew in such a connection than to us, are what we might expect him to employ in speaking of his call. The current ideas of the method of fulfilling such a calling as God opened up to him were diverse and far from clear in their expression. He had spent thirty years of life in coming up to this hour, in meditation and study and observation, and the quiet practise of a life of gentle godliness. He had lived much alone. He had found the comfort of nature. He knew how to enter into the closest fellowship with his Father in the unsullied environment of his handiwork. Now the greatness of his task confronts him, and he feels his need of counsel and support. For this the Spirit drives him into the wilderness. Some such retreat every great soul must make now and then, where he can recall the past and sift it through the narrower present view, and thus produce the material from which the future must be built. "The secret of man is the secret

of the Messiah," the schoolmen used to say. The spirit drives us all into the wilderness. A sojourn there belongs to human conflict. It has a place in normal human experience. Not only for the sorrows and disappointments and the doubts and uncertainties of life, but also in the hour of success and under highest stimulus of opportunity, the soul must stand aside and get its poise and seek a perspective of its tasks. And most of all when the privilege before one is a moral opportunity, there must be this chance to withdraw from the real into the ideal, from the practical into the underlying principles, from the strife and commotion of doing into the calmness and assurance of being. But before this can be reached, the soul must fight its battle with the Tempter, and hold undiminished its full supply of moral energy and moral purpose. He who does that will find at length that angels come and minister unto him.

Every great religious leader has had his time of temptation when he has retreated into the wilderness and fought his battle through alone with God. Zaruthustra was tempted by the evil spirit which besought him to renounce the good law, and so gain power over the nations. Buddha won his confidence thus, and so did Mohammed. Confucius spent three years in

isolation before his life-work began. The immense consequences hanging on the fate of a single man, and upon the method of his activity as a teacher of religion, would drive any son of God apart for a season. The experience of Jesus in the wilderness was normal and significant. The intensity of the spirit of the teacher will always be the gage of the power of his struggle in the spirit, as he clears his mind and prepares his entire being for the work before him. The clarity of his vision of God will likewise regulate the momentousness of the conflict into which he will enter.

This retreat of Jesus served him somewhat as the sojourn of Saul of Tarsus in Arabia served him a few years later. It was a period of readjustment. It was a time for measuring the past and gathering its permanent values, as well as a season for making plans for future action. It gave to Jesus an opportunity similar to that provided by so many primitive peoples in the search for a totem, on which errand every boy is sent before he enters into manhood and undertakes the serious business of his life in the tribe. The guardian spirit who is to preside over his destinies comes to the youth in solitude. He fasts, he prays, he lives in nature's full simplicity until he knows the form in which God will walk with him.[1]

[1] See Hall, Adolescence, Vol. II, chap. XIII.

The need is as deep as religion. It is common to all men, as religion is. But not all respond to the need and seek to satisfy it. A nature of such depth and capacity for spiritual emotion as that which Jesus possessed could not fail to seek, not indeed a totem, but that for which the totem stood to minds less trained in the knowledge of God — the complete sense of the cooperation of God himself with him in all the momentous undertakings upon which he was about to enter.

Jesus was subject to mental visions throughout his life. Not only at his baptism, but in the wilderness, on the Mount of Transfiguration, in Gethsemane, and in every crisis of his life he saw with the inner eye the realities of his faith and held communion with God. He frequently retreated into quiet valleys among the mountains or upon lonely peaks, and beside the sea, to bring his mind into the atmosphere of heaven. He was often agitated under wrath or in performing miracles, as if in touch with unseen forces which stirred within him. But always and everywhere these forces were ordered under his control, and prepared him for fuller power by their touch with his soul. Calm and full of peace, he drew assurance from his conflicts and entered deeper into the fellowship with God with every struggle. He was true to his humanity in such experiences,

but never commonplace in the way in which he grew by them. There was no study of incantations or exorcismal formulas in his mind, such as the Persian cult required in long fasts, nor anything like the assault upon Gautama by the three daughters of the demon, Craving, Discontent, and Lust. His struggle was with his own spiritual self.

The replies of Jesus to the three temptations as preserved to us reveal his attitude toward the work before him.[1] These temptations represent the three phases of Messianism as it confronted him, and therefore the very questions that he had to meet. The first temptation stands for the demand of selfish materialism, like that of the Roman rabble later on when they called for bread and amusement. It was the demand upon God of privilege as the right of his Son. It echoed the Jewish call for an immediate and material provision against suffering and want. It was the intense and insistent demand of the human being in him, bidding him live for himself, and justifying that course by his high office. And it came to him in the insinuating phrase of

[1] "The whole temptation in the wilderness is simply a victory of the moral consciousness over the religion of physical prodigy." — A. SABATIER, *Outlines of a Philosophy of Religion*, p. 73.

possible doubt. It suggested that he ought to be independent of God his Father, as the Messiah. It suggested that he ought to have privileges which other men do not enjoy. Thus this temptation placed before him his relations to both God and man, as well as to nature in which he walked. Should he isolate himself? Should he fail in that perfect dependence in which he had learned to live with his Father? Should he let any use of his power and position come in between him and the men he so longed to convince of the reasonableness of his life as the normal life? Should he permit himself to take a place outside of nature, and over against it, by commanding it to serve him exceptionally? To each of these suggestions he had one answer. Had he allowed a selfish thought to come in between himself and God, then his strength would have departed from him. Had he removed himself from the fullest identity with mankind, he could never have been their Elder Brother. Had he taken a place over against nature, as a sovereign Lord whose least caprice it must serve, he could never have found it the same House of God for his jaded soul that it had been in the past, nor would he ever have been able to lay such confident hands upon its forces in his ministry as he so often did. Jesus rose above the physical and

dwelt serenely in the spiritual realm, where even the inconveniences of the body were remote to him. He kept faith with God and man, and held himself unswervingly to the simplicity of his human life. The apocalyptic visions of his people warranted another course, but he yielded not an inch along their path. He would not take even his body into his own keeping, but left himself altogether in the hands of God. His trust was in his Father, and with serenity and peace he waited upon the spiritual interests involved in his opening career.

With that quick suggestion of opposites so often noticed by all who carry on the strife after higher things, the second temptation jumps to the spiritual ground upon which the victory has been won. As the story is told in St. Matthew, he is urged to take a short cut to power, and to gratify at the same time both the popular desire for a sensation, and his own great faith in God. To cast himself down from the temple top would convince the crowd. It would compel them to believe on him and satisfy some of the expected requirements of the typical Messiah. Many had said that he would come suddenly. What could be more startling than such a coming as that into public view? And many too had prophesied that he would be a supernatural person from

heaven. Could there be a better launching of his projected Messiahship than this spectacular appearance? Again there was the noble test of faith in the eternal care of the Father. Such a casting of himself upon his mercies could not fail to show how closely he was bound to God.

Just these relations to both God and man, and to his own self, he could not assume. To demand of God a merely arbitrary supervision of his destiny, like that, was sure to break forever the closer bond that bound him to his Father. To make himself not one of the simple sons of man, but an exceptional, wonder-breathing character, aloof, awesome, inhuman, was to make impossible forever the close relations of human brotherhood and moral sympathy by which he knew already that his Kingdom must come. Such a coming would preclude the possibility of his ever teaching men the way of love, and bringing them into sonship like his own to the common Father. He sought not to convince the senses, but the consciences, of men. He had no desire to set himself above them, but every interest in keeping as close as possible to common human beings. To cut himself off from humanity was not his way of ascent to divinity, but to live a perfect human life. He could no more adopt the spectacular method of so much

of the apocalyptic speculations than he could serve his appetite and deliver himself from inconvenience through his new and absorbing consciousness of power.

There was another common demand of the people upon their Messianic ideal. They felt the shame of their national dependence and the bitterness of political subjection to people whom they despised and looked upon as usurpers of their rights. The Messiah they looked for was to deliver them by a stretched-out arm. He was to bear the sword. Worldly power alone could deliver Israel, and armies well equipped must follow the Davidic king. They knew something of world powers. If Israel were to subjugate them all, even if she were to avenge herself of the Roman tyranny, she must be like Rome. The earthly powers must serve the heavenly King.

This conception Jesus steadfastly refused to consider. A Kingdom indeed he will establish, but it shall not be of the earth, nor shall its might be that of arms. It shall be world-wide in extent, but it shall not depend upon the sword for its propagation. To adopt the current plan of a warring Messiah would be to fall down and worship Satan himself. He will maintain at all hazards, even though he does not know how he will come out, the lofty ideals of his heart, and

pursue the even tenor of his way, even though it seems unreasonable and unattractive to the average man. He faces the old with a selective scrutiny that will not pass one single feature that fails to stand his spiritual test, and fills in, with confidence in the final outcome, the new and difficult personal features of his own cherished ideal. Rejecting all compromise, it was "Christ or Mohammed," and only one of those alternatives attracted him.

Thus Jesus won his right to a richer faith and a higher place in the world of heroic natures. Thus he conquered in the fight with custom and prejudice and current opinion, even before he had met them in the concrete and individual forms through which they were destined to troop past him on his way and challenge his every deed and word. This great soul was reenforced by his temptations, as is every soul who conquers in such an hour. He was brought into closer touch with God, as is every man who stands firm for that which he feels is right, even at great cost. Failure, I suppose, was not thought possible by Jesus in those hours, for he had all the fresh enthusiasm and confidence of youth and victory. And with a high courage and buoyant heart he went down from his forty days to begin with men the labors to which he had given his life.

The temptation was not a time of heart-searching as to the genuineness of his Messianic calling, but a time for determining the method of applying the powers he knew were his. Should he work for himself, or for God and man? For immediate results, or for final destiny? With moral and spiritual forces alone, or with use of the material resources of his Father? Should his own great gifts of mysterious psychic power serve his own interests at any time, or only those of God? These are the questions he asked, and to these he found an answer.

Each of the temptations had to do with the natural longing of an earnest heart for results. How could a spirit on fire with passion wait indefinitely for the response to his plain and urgent proclamation? He came as a sower of good seed. He naturally wanted to see the harvest, or at least the springing grain. But the patience of a perfect faith, and the long-suffering of a soul satisfied with the expenditure of itself, were necessary to his future work. These he acquired in those days of struggle with the temptations of opportunism, — opportunism of the body, in use of divine power for physical ends; opportunism of sense, in casting himself down from the pinnacle of the temple; opportunism of political supremacy, in using worldly means to reach

heavenly ends. He came to know the things the Son of God could never permit himself to do. He progressed far along the way of a new conception of the Messianic calling as it must be worked out in its detail. He had always been sure that it must be a moral, not a political, office; he came to see how the end determines the means. He caught a glimpse of the constant thwarting of the popular will which he was to experience. Yet he did not lose hope. From the wilderness he went back to his place among men with rare confidence in himself and his mission, to proclaim the Kingdom of God as close at hand, a personal and inner realization of the divine law. He hoped and believed that men would see as he did, and accept his teaching soon, and join him in the joyous labors of establishing the Kingdom on the earth.

CHAPTER VII

THE KINGDOM OF GOD ACCORDING TO JESUS

Jesus used both of the expressions "The Kingdom of God" and "The Kingdom of heaven," probably, with preference for the latter, to avoid using the name of God according to the common practise of the day. The Old Testament use of the term, meaning a present political kingdom, and the apocalyptic use of it as of one to come, mark the two extremes of current faith. John preached a future but imminent kingdom on the earth. The ordinary Jewish Messianic faith implied conquest and world-power, but the term Kingdom of heaven referred to an abstract reign of God.

Jesus did not swing to either extreme, but used the words of both the present and the future, of the concrete as well as the abstract, though never of a political kingdom. He saw a real kingdom here on earth, but it extended far on into the future. He taught what was true in apocalyptic visions, and used the poetic, symbolic expressions of that literature, when he could gain attention

and not be misunderstood; and he also taught the gradual approach of an earthly Kingdom already begun in the hearts of men. He was neither exclusively ethical in his conceptions nor wholly eschatological; he was both. His prime teaching was, The Kingdom is within you. Whether the preposition is translated "within" or "among," the same spiritual interpretation must be placed upon it. In human hearts made true and obedient to love, in lives of service in his name, the signs of the Kingdom's presence might be seen. He was intensely ethical in his idea. Such a Kingdom could not come all at once, nor apart from human aid; it was absolutely dependent upon human effort and cooperation, and like the mustard seed, the leaven, the growing grain in the field, it must have time for its completion. So he taught, now that the Kingdom is to come, now that it is here; and both were true. But there is no sign that an earthly, political monarchy was ever thought of by him after the struggle when he resisted all such temptation in favor of his nobler, inner Kingdom in the hearts of men. He spoke in pictures, and with an immediate personal purpose, in almost every word of his preserved to us.

The leading factor in his gospel was ethical, not apocalyptic. He never separated the ethical

from the apocalyptic, nor the eschatological from the ethical. Religion and morals he united in spite of man's endeavor to put them asunder. They are mutually inclusive. He knew of no religion minus morality, nor of morals minus religion. He would endorse Paul's phrase, "The kingdom of God is not meat and drink; but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost." His Kingdom was not of this world, because it was not political. It was emphatically of this world in the sense that it must flourish here. And everywhere where human souls exist will be the place of his Kingdom. The leaven of his spirit he believed would transform the world in time. The Kingdom, to him, was more the family, than the empire, of God.

Fifty-three times in the Gospel of Matthew, sixteen times in Mark, thirty-nine times in Luke, and five times in John, allusion, more or less full, is made to the Kingdom of heaven or of God. The two terms are used synonymously. There was a long program adopted by the rabbis to be followed out in introducing the Kingdom. The final bitterness, the coming of Elijah, followed by the Messiah; the final conquest of their enemies, Jerusalem reinstated as a world capital, the Dispersion organized, a glorious day in Palestine, the world restored; the general resur-

rection, the last judgment and the final and eternal salvation and punishment, — this was what they taught, according to Schürer.[1] This ordered way Jesus did not treasure. He called John, the forerunner, "Elijah" (Matt. 11: 14; 17: 12), but the plans of earthly conquest he changed into spiritual experiences. He did teach that the old, present age was about to collapse, but his assertions deal with unendurable conditions on the ethical side. There was a certain tinge of other-worldliness in some of his utterances (Mark 13: 24 ff.), but he steadfastly refused to indulge in the mathematics of eschatology.[2] The transformation of the world and the coming of the Kingdom were one event, not two, and he was confessedly ignorant of the time. He promised blessedness and peace to all who would practise the laws of the Kingdom, and this high estate was to begin at once for all who would enter in. Righteousness and love must ever secure the blessedness of which he spoke and which characterized the Kingdom he proclaimed. He taught, not a social philosophy, but the practical and personal bearing of individuals in a state where the purest social philosophy might be formulated upon an ethico-religious basis. Philosophies never originate movements; move-

[1] II. 126 ff. [2] Matt. 25: 19; Luke 20: 9; 21: 8, 24.

ments give rise to philosophies. Jesus sought to set men to living right, and that was the essential thing. Thus he instituted the highest morals of the world and set the purest standards of conduct. He did not attempt to lay down rules, nor to enter into any casuistry, although multitudes have tried to make out a cast-iron Christian system, and to fit the peculiar glove of circumstances in his age upon the hand of each succeeding generation.

Entrance to the Kingdom Jesus found a narrow gate, through which all who came in must pass one at a time, not *en masse*. He was intensely individualistic in his conceptions, in spite of the fact that he was founding a new order of society. He began with the raw material, and made sure of that first. He worked from within outward, and so joined himself to nature's ways. Not war and violence, but peace and rest; not a political kingdom, but a true life fit for eternity, — this is what he sought for from the first. First the blade, then the ear, and only after the long summer came the full corn. The leaven worked unseen and slowly from within, as the seed of the farmer grew.

The brotherhood idea was not wanting in the mind of Jesus. The children of the common Father were to be united in following him, and

in the working out of his overmastering passion for mankind. This fellowship was bound at length to transform the world and to establish a wholly new society, whose law should be love and service. The Ritschlian theology is warranted in its sociological thinking, and has developed a needed phase of the teaching of Jesus for our day. His method was that of nature, by the inspiration of a new life. "He deposited in it a new principle; but he left in it many obscurities, abandoning to time and to the force of events the task of bringing out the consequences and clearing up confusions."[1]

The eschatological language which Jesus used cannot have meant to him what it meant to current Judaism; but like all of his teaching, it was intended for the ear attuned to his spiritual message. Interpreted wholly as referring to the individual experience, and the Kingdom within, the events and processes, the portents and seasons, all may find a counterpart. To assert that he spoke these words in the voice of his day, is to make impossible the entire drift of his teachings about the Kingdom. He saw the sudden coming of the inner Kingdom as a constant possibility in human hearts, but his gaze was not

[1] Sabatier, Outlines of the Philosophy of Religion, pp. 188, 189.

fixed upon the clouds in wrapt expectancy. If he used the "little apocalypse" in Mark (13: 7–9*a*, 14–20, 24–27, 30) he cannot possibly have failed to adapt it to his dominant purpose and to apply it to the Kingdom he had taught and hoped to establish then and there. A sudden transformation would never bring the Kingdom of Good Will which Jesus announced. Its one essential was the inner progress of grace, which must have time.

Jesus did not contemplate an organization apart from the Jewish faith in which he was born, but rather an outgrowth from it in vital incarnation of the deepest spirit of that faith. He did gather the Twelve with evident intent to leave to them the work of inoculating others with the virtue of his spirit. He warned them of the hatred and persecution into which they would be brought [1] and joined that expectation to his own sufferings and death. He spoke doom upon the unbelieving Jews and Gentiles alike [2] but did not think of having his words magnified to a prophecy of earthly catastrophe.

The Fourth Gospel, written later than the others, in the maturer conceptions of a tried faith, sets forth the idea of a slower process in the

[1] Matt. 10: 24 ff.; Luke 12: 49–53; Mark 10: 37–39.
[2] Luke 10: 13–15; 11: 29–31, 49–51.

growth of the Kingdom, and indeed substitutes for the Jewish idea of the Kingdom the Greek idea of eternal life, which is so closely synonymous with it. We cannot doubt that this more modern formulation of the spirit of the teaching of Jesus represents for us the content of the mind of Christ.

There was a great contrast between the teaching of Jesus as to the Kingdom and that of the rabbis. "This new conception was a startling one. Whereas prophets, priests, and apocalyptists had thought of the ultimate earthly state of blessedness as a moral and political reconstruction of the nation, — political independence and perfection of national obedience to the Law, — Jesus made the essence of the new life to be the purity of the individual soul. The Deliverer, who had always been conceived of as a temporal king, he held to be a teacher, sent from God to show men the spirit of the divine Law."[1]

He announced principles which tended to abrogate the ceremonial, to abolish outward distinctions, and to lead to the conclusion that all men stood in the same relation to God. He had to use modes of expression current at that time and always, for his sacred theme. This makes the outer parallels between his teaching and that

[1] Toy, Judaism and Christianity, p. 415.

of the rabbis here peculiarly numerous. Yet nowhere are they farther apart. For instance, in the Beatitudes, he took what seem to be common terms of expression for the blessings of their outer Messianic age, and showed the inner, truest meanings for the poor in spirit, the hungry and those thirsting after righteousness.

When Hillel says, "My humility is my greatness, and my greatness my humility," he reveals in saying it how wide a contrast lies between his spirit and the true humility of Jesus. The title "Kingdom of heaven" was a Jewish one; it was taken from its narrowness and made as broad as the heavens by the new Teacher. They taught one to expect a deliverance from Rome; Jesus, a salvation from sin. They taught righteousness of form as a condition of entering the Kingdom; he a spiritual, inner righteousness which was to be a badge of membership — ethical, not physical holiness, was what he sought. Nowhere is the contrast better shown than in St. Paul's discussion of the Law in Romans and Galatians. Law left him in bondage and uncertainty, even despair. From it, Christ Jesus rescued him; and he saw the necessity — so overshadowing is this phase of his experience — of relating all Christ's life and death to this great deliverance, and of reasoning out a theory how

it was done. Out of overwhelming fear he came to joy and peace; from beggarly elements to the inheritance incorruptible. The Kingdom was a future picture to the expectant Jews. Jesus made it present, immediate. At first he said it was at hand, and later that it was beginning already.[1] Thus it became the touchstone by which all earthly relations were changed to an atmosphere of peace and joy constantly about believers. No earthly advantage was included in it, — but there was assurance of eternal life. And that life was newly conceived, for it was spiritualized and made more definite. Resurrection was relieved of its speculative tinge and became an object of faith and necessary religious hope. The Kingdom was not external, not political, not limited to the nation even, not mediate in relation to God, nor was it dependent on a legal formalism, nor put off to a vague future. It was inner, spiritual; directly related to God, universal, of grace, not law, — under a Messiah who stood among them.

The Sermon on the Mount certainly has a normative relation to thought regarding the Kingdom, and deserves its titles of code, Magna Charta, etc. "The temporary design of our Lord in the beatitudes," says Tholuck, "was to

[1] Matt. 12: 28; Luke 11: 20.

crush the hope of external felicity, which was all that the people expected from the Messiah."[1] The complete sermon he calls a delineation of the moral law of Christianity in its general outlines. So sure was the Council of Trent[2] that Christ gave a new law that it anathematized any one who taught otherwise. It was new as all his mission was new, — a spiritual development of that which men were fast petrifying into hard formalism. And it was a present Kingdom,[3] which St. John had a perfect right to interpret in terms of present spiritual life.

Admission to this Kingdom was not by legalism, nor by potitical fitness, not by the accumulated righteousness of others, nor by catastrophe. It was by repentance, showing openness of spirit to God, who could thus alone fill the soul, — by poverty of spirit. Theirs is the Kingdom of God. A reward is added, as a matter of abundant grace, and victory over the great enemy Satan is a matter of course. Righteousness, or a perfect fulfilling of the will of God, is an essential part of the Kingdom. Fulfilment of the Law is to be the kernel, but in spirit, not in form. The

[1] Sermon on Mount, 1, 97.

[2] Sixth Session, 21st Canon.

[3] Matt. 11: 12; 12: 28; 16: 19; Luke 16: 16; 17: 20; 21: Mark 12: 34.

result of the strife of love to fulfil all is the Kingdom.

The work of the Messiah, as well as the Messiah's self, must be different in such a Kingdom from that of the expected Messiah of the day. And because of this difference, he must be a prophet, a teacher of spiritual truth. Jesus often styles himself so.[1] Thus he began his ministry.

Nowhere, perhaps, is there greater contrast between the teaching of the rabbis and that of Jesus than in the doctrines regarding sin and sinners and forgiveness. The former said little about sin, save the formal neglect of the Law. To Jesus, sin is the great rival power against Righteousness, which is the soul of the Kingdom. To it, then, Jesus must have peculiar relation. He is the embodiment of deliverance from it, and of forgiveness. "All other systems know of no welcome till the sinner has ceased to sin. He must first be a penitent, then he will find welcome. Christ welcomes him to God, and so makes him penitent."[2]

And as this power is universal, so the work of Christ in forgiveness must be; the spiritual nature of the Kingdom is the ground for the relation to sin and for the universal rule of the Messiah.

[1] Mark 6: 4; Matt. 10: 40, 41; 15: 24; 21: 3, 4.

[2] Edersheim.

There comes in also the interpretation of Isaiah 53, of the Messiah, which, if not utterly new with Jesus, was at least adopted and vitalized by his gentle spirit.

So Jesus taught men to pray to God as to their Father. He introduced them to a Kingdom already in process of becoming, whose reign is not by Law but by Love. He showed them how human nature was the ground for it, not Judaism, and how the true Messiah must come to teach, to comfort and to suffer for sin, and rise from the death inflicted by the powers of evil to a life of constant spiritual service of his Father's children. Upon these three foundation stones he was content to rest the superstructure of his mission: the revelation of God as the personal Father of men; the saving grace of the Father's love; and the saving righteousness of a responsive, filial affection.

CHAPTER VIII

THE MESSIANIC TITLES AS JESUS USED THEM

For several years the battle has been waged around the titles which are assigned to Jesus in the Gospels. So sharp has it become that the latest writer in America in this field [1] has frankly confessed that the whole question of the person of Jesus rests upon the interpretation given to the title "Son of man," which he is assumed in the Gospels to have used of himself.

The philological argument as stated by Wellhausen and his school is based upon the probability that Jesus, if he used any such phrase as ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου stands for in the Greek, must have employed the common Aramaic words "Bar nasha." In Aramaic the phrase must mean man, generically, or be an indefinite, but never can it be a title. The translators of an early Aramaic tradition into Greek were misled into the baldest literalism, and rendered this idiomatic expression word for word, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, instead of according to its real meaning.

[1] Schmidt, The Prophet of Nazareth, p. 131.

This reinterpretation the scholar then applies to every case in which his criticism finds the Greek phrase employed with probability of historicity, and demonstrates that the meaning assumed for the Aramaic expression fits all demands of the text. This done, the conclusion is drawn that Jesus never made a claim that he was the Messiah, and that he never dreamed of such a thing, but even definitely and persistently denied such a mission and refused such a title.

Let us examine first the philological argument, and then the application of it to the gospel.

It is probable that Jesus did speak Aramaic, although he may easily have known and probably did know Hebrew, and may have had some acquaintance with Greek. The Greek names among his earliest followers suggest that he moved in a society not altogether removed from Greek influences.[1] Assuming that he spoke his gospel to Aramaic-speaking people, however, the tradition which brought it down to us would naturally have an original Aramaic form, although with constant and increasing tendency to assume a Greek expression of it also. As the Church spread far and wide from Jerusalem in

[1] The conjecture of Sanday and Driver that Jesus may have used the phrase first in Greek while addressing Galileans in that tongue cannot be proved to be even probable.

the days of Paul, this Greek tradition became a necessity, and assumed a fixed form, alongside the Aramaic tradition, which must have been dear to the Jewish Christians in every church, even in Rome. There must have been constant and careful comparison between the two, and even sharp criticism of the Greek tradition by those who held fast to the seemingly older and more accurate Aramaic wording. In every critical expression, and highly significant word, especially touching the person of Jesus and his Messianic mission, the Jewish members of those early churches would have been keen to detect any radical departure from their personal and cherished Aramaic accounts. The facts established in the Acts and in the epistles of St. Paul, even if we confine ourselves to the five epistles which are generally conceded to belong to him, all indicate that there was a sharp rivalry between the two elements in the new Church which would guarantee that the gospel as rendered into Greek should be a strict and reliable rendering of the meaning as well as the words of Jesus as he must have expressed himself in the Aramaic.

If this reasoning is fair, then it is unfair to assume that we can translate the Greek back into Aramaic, declare that Jesus used the very expression we employ, and then assert that this

Aramaic phrase does not mean at all what the Greek phrase does from which we translated it. Shall we conclude that the original Greek tradition, worked out in the midst of hot and bitter conflict, by slow degrees, not in a cool scholarly atmosphere with a lexicon and grammar over night, was mistaken in its rendering of a simple and commonplace expression into a highly important and critical title which no Jew on the other side could detect and no leader like Peter or Paul could correct? Or is it a more natural inference that the modern scholar, however well equipped with lexicons and texts — and his equipment in reality is both meager and difficult to interpret — has failed to reconstruct the text exactly as it stood in the Aramaic tradition? Is it a matter after all of the letter, or of the idea? If the latter is the important thing, the philological argument hardly suffices to overthrow it alone. The dogmatism of criticism is no more worthy to rank as argument than the dogmatism of faith. To declare that Jesus cannot have used the phrase "Bar nasha" as a title is to beg the question. To assert that Jesus must have used this particular phrase is also an assumption that we can hardly make, in the paucity of our knowledge of the dialect he spoke. And to pronounce it settled that Jesus never called himself

Son of man, upon such evidence, is to assume that possibilities are probabilities and probabilities certainties. There is abundant evidence in the undisputed epistles of St. Paul that he and those to whom he wrote had very definite convictions about the Messianic office of Jesus, and that they never doubted that he recognized himself as the Messiah, difficult as that was for the Greek and the Roman to accept.

When it comes to applying the assumed Aramaic phrase "Bar nasha" to all the passages which the latest criticism leaves unassailed, the demonstration of the precariousness of the conclusions reached by Wellhausen and Schmidt is complete. These passages are, according to Schmidt,[1] Matt. 8:20; 9:6; 11:19; 12:8; 12:32*a*; 20:18, with 17:22 left in doubt. Three passages occur also in Luke (the first, third, and fifth), the others in the Synoptic tradition. The first passage reads, "The foxes have holes, and the birds of the air have nests; but the Son of man hath not where to lay his head." This was said in reply to the ardent profession of a certain scribe who in his enthusiasm over the healing of many sick people, declared, "Master, I will follow thee whithersoever thou goest." To substitute the proposed translation of "Bar nasha" here, making

[1] pp. 121–125.

Jesus say in reply, "A man hath not where to lay his head," with no reference to himself or the risk incurred in following him, is to rob the passage of sense and pertinence. The second reference is to the story of the man sick of the palsy, where Jesus replies to the criticism of the scribes, "That ye may know that the Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins, . . . Arise, take up thy bed." Apply the generic meaning to Son of man, and the sense is materially altered, not only for the verse but for the entire passage. He would not prove by his healing the man that any man who came along could forgive sins. He meant evidently to imply that since he could heal an apparently incurable disease, he could do what seemed to them a part of the same act, since they believed disease was a sign of guilt, namely, forgive his sins. In dealing with this passage Schmidt (p. 197) passes quickly from the real issue, the forgiving of sins, to the *declaration* of forgiveness, the assurance that sins are forgiven, namely by God. Of course man may make that proclamation, but to forgive is a divine prerogative, and the whole meaning hinges upon that understanding. Did Jesus merely tell the man that God forgave him, and in doing so explain to the lookers-on that any man could do that? Or did he actually presume to forgive

the man himself, with an assumption of divine prerogative? There can be no doubt that the latter is the true meaning, and it is sustained by the phrase "on earth," as if he, in earthly form, must do what God in heaven was pleased to do. The proposed rendering of "Bar nasha" evidently does not meet the needs of the passage.

The third reference is to Matt. 11: 19. There Jesus makes his characteristic contrast between the coming of John Baptist and the bearing of the Son of man who came eating and drinking. To assume that he said that man in general came eating and drinking, and that they said, "Behold a man gluttonous, and a winebibber," would be hard to accept; but when one tries to make the rest of the passage, "a friend of publicans and sinners," fit in with the generic meaning of Son of man, it is simply impossible to accept that interpretation. It would be to make the words both irrelevant and untrue. The average man was precisely not a friend of publicans and sinners.

The favorite application of the proposed new meaning of Son of man by the Wellhausen school is to Matt. 12: 8, in the matter of Sabbath observance. It seems plausible in itself that Jesus may have meant that as the Sabbath is made for man, so man is lord of the Sabbath. But there

are objections even here. That merely repeats what he has said; he does not follow up his references to David and the priests, whose acts were hallowed by their office; "one greater than the temple" cannot refer to a man as such. And Jesus never so far abrogated the sacred institutions as to set the average man as lord above any one of them. He could not have used such a term in this connection.

The fifth passage which has stood the tests of critical examination is Matt. 12: 32*a*. "And whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him." Here the meaning might be established with the proposed interpretation, so that the contrast would be between speech against a man and speech against God; but the connection indicates clearly that there is no such contrast in the mind of Jesus, if he is correctly reported. The words follow, and reply to, the criticism of his casting out devils. The argument is this: "If you will, criticize me, and call me what you choose; but do not insult the Spirit of God."

Schmidt does not deny the originality of Matt. 17: 22, but remarks that 20: 18 seems more probable, as if the thought which appears in each could not be repeated. Taking up the latter reference, where Jesus announces that "the Son

of man shall be betrayed" when they shall come into Jerusalem, it is manifest that a substitution of the generic meaning for the phrase does not satisfy either the declaration itself or the passage.

The first and third passages contain a proverbial expression, probably often repeated, as such expressions always are, and as teachers among the Jews were accustomed to reiterate important truths. They lose at once their point, and hence their use, in the proposed interpretation. The second and fourth citations are from arguments where the entire application hinges upon the reference to Jesus himself. The fifth is a rebuke and the sixth a warning, neither of which can stand if "Son of man" must mean only "a man." It needs no further application of the "Bar nasha" theory to prove that it is not satisfactory for one who retains the words in their Greek connection or who desires to make such sense of the passages where they occur as warrants the use of them. Doubtless the effort to find the Aramaic words which Jesus spoke is a fruitful and commendable venture of criticism; but it must be conducted with full appreciation of the value of the Greek as a vehicle of thought, and of the ability of those who brought down the Greek tradition to express in it, at least as carefully

as we can in Aramaic, the exact shade of meaning which Jesus had in mind. The question raised in the "Bar nasha" discussion is not merely one of analytical criticism, but also one of common sense and constructive thinking. As long as the common interpretation according to the Greek tradition is so fully borne out by the sense of the passages, both those which Schmidt accepts as "originals" and much more those which he rejects, it is easier to believe that Jesus did use some expression corresponding to "The Son of man" as a title for himself.

What did Jesus mean by the title? Evidently, as it appears in two connections, he had two distinct but related purposes in employing it. If, as it is natural to infer, he took the words from Dan. 7: 13, he must have put into them something of the meaning of that passage. To that "Son of man" coming on the clouds, there was given "dominion, and glory, and a kingdom." This idea Jesus did not express in the earlier use of the title, however much it had to do with his choice of it. He could not afford to risk the misunderstandings that would have been involved. For this fuller meaning he had to prepare the minds of his hearers to appreciate his idea of a dominion and his ideal of a kingdom. Hence we find him using the title "Son of man" with

an almost opposite meaning. Into his every thought of glory and throughout all his speech about the Kingdom, he shot the idea of spiritual superiority based upon self-forgetfulness and a devoted service. Nowhere is there a more characteristic word of his preserved than this:[1] "The Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many." A careful classification of all passages where the title appears, not including parallels, shows that in ten the suggestion of humiliation and suffering is present; in eleven either a mere pronominal use appears in place of the first personal pronoun, or else an idea of administering to human need; and in eighteen the apocalyptic element predominates. Sixteen of the eighteen apocalyptic passages belong after the confession of Peter at Cæsarea Philippi, and of the two before that event Matt. 10: 23 belongs to the charge given to the Twelve before they were sent out to preach, and Matt. 13: 41 is an explanation of a parable which may well be considered to have been supplied by the writer. The ten passages, in which the idea of humiliation and suffering predominates, all occur after the crisis referred to above; and of the eleven other, less formal, more pronominal uses of the title, six

[1] Matt. 20: 28; Mark 10: 45.

appear in the text before and five after that event. The parallel passages in other Gospels sometimes use the bare "I" or "me." The inference may be drawn that the earlier use of the title by Jesus was of this more general, mystical order, to conceal his thought rather than to reveal anything about himself. His use changed with his purpose, and he must have felt all restraint removed when at last the disciples recognized his Messianic mission and his Messianic character, so that he could employ the title with immediate reference to the passage in Daniel, which could not have been unfamiliar to his synagogue-bred followers. But the popular conception as to the Messiah, which even his most intimate followers shared, he had to correct; and therefore we find the contrasted use of the exalted phrase, to guard against misunderstandings and to secure that sense of the humility of true greatness which Jesus taught, and the losing of self in service which he never failed to emphasize as the characteristic activity of his Kingdom. Fiebig [1] is right in his reasoning that Jesus used the title at first to mystify.

However, when his disciples made their great discovery and confessed their faith in him as the Messiah, he rapidly developed the two ideas

[1] Der Menschensohn, Jesu Selbstbezeichniss.

which the phrase held for him into a full-orbed truth. The same process is reflected in the Fourth Gospel also, which deals almost entirely with the last days of Jesus, and unites both meanings of the title Son of man upon the lips of Jesus. It suggests likewise (12: 34) the uncertainty and confusion in the popular mind regarding the title. "Who is this Son of man?" they ask. They were not accustomed to employ the phrase as a Messianic title. It was not common. It is found only in a portion of Enoch and in 4th Esdras, and it is possible that these should not be assigned to a date before Christ. Jesus originated the new and striking use of the Daniel phrase, probably, at least as far as he himself is concerned, and appropriated to himself as the conscious leader of the nation the term describing the nation in that familiar passage. With his active mind seeking everywhere for food to satisfy his eager spirit in his quest for opportunity to serve and lead, he could not have heard those words in Daniel 7: 13, 14 without applying them to himself. He was so bound up with the nation, his whole life-purpose was so exactly that of the theocracy, that the words seemed to him written expressly to formulate his mission. However the rabbis read them, he was not accustomed to submit his intellect to their wills nor to shape

his thought by theirs. As the words in Isaiah (61: 1–3) were taken by him in the synagogue at Nazareth in perfect good faith as pointing to him and his life-work, so he saw in the Son of man passage what doubtless no others saw, a peculiar personal connection with himself and with his mission. He may not have realized at first how difficult it would be for others to see that connection, but he made the better use of the title because of that fact, while he trained his disciples in perception of the fuller truth respecting himself.

The other title which the Gospels employ of Jesus appears in the form "Son of God," and also in that of "The Son." In the Synoptics the former is found twenty-seven times and the latter nine times. The Fourth Gospel has "The Son of God" ten times, "The Son" fourteen times, and "The only-begotten Son" twice, "Thy Son" once. Jesus is seldom represented as using the longer title, but commonly employs the words "The Son." A more metaphysical meaning is evidently attached to the words in the latest Gospel, not only in the phrase "only-begotten" but everywhere.

The title was a recognized title of the Messiah, as derived from Old Testament references to the theocratic king,[1] and to the people themselves

[1] 2 Sam. 7: 14; Ps. 2: 7; 89: 26, 27.

collectively.[1] It was used with such a meaning in Matt. 16: 16; Mark 14: 61; John 11: 27; 20: 31. It was Messianic, however, not because of its primary meaning, but secondarily, because the theocratic king or the nation was so called. There was also a certain apocalyptic flavor about it. The king was the representative of God, and partook of his sanctity.[2] There was no warmth in it upon the popular tongue, for the current idea of God was of one too remote to make a close personal relation between even the Messiah and God one of affection and intimacy. It meant, rather, belonging to God, and that an ethical relationship, worked out by the spiritually-minded, was beginning to appear.[3]

Was this title used by Jesus, or did he permit it to be used of him? And if so what did he mean by it? The current critical analysis by way of the Aramaic renders the phrase in that dialect "Bar Elaha" and denies the use of it by

[1] Ex. 4: 22; Deut. 1: 31; 8: 5; 32: 6; Jer. 23: 5; Hos. 11: 1.

[2] The idea was wide-spread among Gentiles, as realized in both mythical and historic characters. Egyptian kings were long considered incarnations, and sacrifice and prayers were offered to them. Babylonian kings were called divine. The East influenced Rome to worship the emperor, even while he lived.

[3] Ps. Sol. 7: 30; 18: 4; 4 Esdras 6: 58.

Jesus anywhere. But the Gospels are so agreed in the tradition that it is difficult to prove that position. It is true that Philo laid foundations for the fullest development of the Christian doctrine of the Son of God when he called the Logos "The perfect Son" and "The first-born Son of God," but it is not at all impossible that the idea was associated with Jesus in his ministry, and especially at his death.

The term appears in the Synoptics in five connections as follows:

(1) In the Gospel of the infancy, the angel of the annunciation predicts that Jesus will be the Son of God by miraculous physical birth; an idea not advanced anywhere else, either by Jesus or of him. In the genealogy also as it appears in Luke, he is declared Son of God through Adam. This reasoning appears nowhere else. Neither of these presentations seems to have had the least influence with Jesus, if indeed he knew of them.

(2) Voices from heaven came to his ear twice at great crises of his experience, declaring him to be the well-beloved Son of God, and twice during his temptation the suggestion came to him, in the form of an insinuation that he might not be God's Son. These subjective experiences must have been narrated to the disciples by

Jesus himself. There is no other way for accounting for them. The consciousness that he bore a close personal relationship to God had long been his, and had set him apart and become the chief joy and inspiration of his life. What could be more natural than that Jesus should have heard these voices of good and of evil, reenforcing or attacking the heart of his belief, where his greatest strength lay and his hopes for the future? The dress of the story, objectifying these spiritual experiences, has been justified, if indeed it needs justification, by the common approval given to it through the ages. What our day and race would tell in less vivid form, and without these striking pictures, is set before the reader in a way to make it real for all ages, and simple for all who read for spirit and not for letter.

(3) Demoniacs are represented as crying out in the presence of Jesus and proclaiming him the Son of God. The current theories regarding them assigned to these afflicted persons a clairvoyant sort of discernment. We tend to look upon them as afflicted with mental maladies which sometimes offer just such clairvoyant phenomena, and we can therefore the easier appreciate the powers assigned to them by the Jews. But while their testimony becomes of no worth to us as proof of the fact declared, it is of

value as a reflection of popular opinion in the midst of which they lived, and which had impressed upon them either a longing for or a dread of cure.

(4) The disciples are represented as using the title Son of God only twice, when they were especially startled by Jesus as he appeared to them in the storm upon the sea at night, and when Peter made his great confession at Cæsarea Philippi. They seem to have had so intimate a friendship with Jesus that he never permitted them to feel that he was in any sense removed from them afar off, or exalted above them. His entire gospel was one of salvation by friendship, and he made it operative in them by his warm human love and his close companionship. The conception of uniqueness of his Sonship to God is apparent. It was no ethical relationship that enabled him to come to them upon the sea, nor was it any mere general term of human or racial meanings which Peter employed, but rather a title reserved for the Messiah.

(5) At the trial and death of Jesus most of the passages containing this title appear. When the high priest challenged Jesus whether he was the Son of God, Mark doubtless gives in his reply, "I am," the key to the rather enigmatical answers given in the other Synoptics. Jesus claimed the

honorable title. The passers by his cross and the chief priests agree in charging him with this to them presumptuous sin. The centurion's declaration, spoken from the standpoint of a Roman soldier, only classes Jesus in his opinion with all heroes.

These are all the passages where the entire phrase appears. The shortened form of it, "The Son," is found nine times, in five passages, or if parallels are not counted, in three. Each one is in the mouth of Jesus. They are as follows: "All things have been delivered unto me of my Father: and no one knoweth the Son, save the Father; neither doth any know the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal him."[1] "But of that day and hour knoweth no one, not even the angels of heaven, neither the Son, but the Father only."[2] The third is the baptismal formula as given in Matthew from the lips of the risen Jesus, which appears to be of too late an origin to be counted among the historic passages upon which we can rely.

Concerning the other two, it may be said that they express a sense of unique and intimate relationship with God, not of a metaphysical

[1] Matt. 11: 27; Luke 10: 22.
[2] Matt. 24: 36; Mark 13: 32.

sort, but of a sort that lifted him above the common human appreciation of God, while it did not give him omniscience or even the fullest share in the knowledge of his own future and of the things that concerned his Kingdom. Such an intimacy is the matured conception that resulted from the experience which the growing boy had in the temple when his parents sought him sorrowing; and in amazement at their failure to realize where he would be, he said, "Knew ye not that I must be in the things of my Father?" It is probable, then, that Jesus used the terms Father and Son, of God and himself, very freely all through his life. He did not indicate anywhere by their use an idea of physical generation through a miraculous conception, nor did he give to the terms a metaphysical content such as they undoubtedly afterward came to hold, under the influences of a growing doctrinal apprehension of the gospel. He seems to have used these terms of relationship first to express his sense of a close and constant dependence upon God, and to have filled them with warmth of a fresh and vital affection. As he grew up into the consciousness of his mission, as the teacher and leader of his people, to a fuller and more spiritual conception of religion, he saw that these terms expressed precisely the relationship in

which every true child of God should stand with Him. Hence he emphasized the ethical content of sonship, and declared in the beatitude that the peacemakers shall be called the children of God. Still he used the term Son of God as peculiarly adapted to express his own private relationship to the Father, not only because of the perfection of his ethical life and the fulness of his love, but also doubtless because of a certain official accent in the title Son of God which was hereditary in the nation as the characteristic of both the Israelitish people and the ideal king who was to realize in higher, spiritual fruition, the kingdom of which prophets and saints had dreamed so long. He taught a universal Fatherhood of God, by the birds the Father feeds, and the flowers his love clothes.[1] "If ye then, being evil," said he, "know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your Father who is in heaven give good things to them that ask him?"

As in every phase of his development, he did not find this idea in his environment or in the ancient history of his people and adopt it as his own. He found it first within his own soul, and nourished it there until its rich and overflowing life drew to itself the more formal and less per-

[1] Matt. 6: 26–32.

sonal phases of sonship in king and nation, and thus the whole was spiritualized for him and made one. This is apparent in the parables which involve the idea of sonship to God. In the parable of The Vineyard, if the Jewish folk, not the Messiah, is the "beloved Son," king and nation were as one; and in that of The Wedding Feast he is the "king's son," without a doubt.

One other title is given to Jesus in Mark (10: 47) by blind Bartimæus who was rebuked for calling him "Thou son of David." When he came near to Jesus, he addressed him as Rabboni, thus placing him upon the same level with the teachers who healed in their streets, and making the other title of no worth. This story is paralleled in Matthew (20: 30, 31) by the account of the healing of two blind men who also address Jesus as "son of David." The same title is found in the mouth of the Canaanitish woman,[1] and may account for his strange answer, in which we feel there is so little of the gentle, service-seeking, compassionate Jesus. The woman, choosing a distinctively Jewish title, set herself over against him and alienated him from the beginning, in spite of her prayer and her deep desire for the cure of her child. That may

[1] Matt. 15: 22.

suggest also why she vexed the disciples, with her racial antipathy. Jesus held back his gift of healing until "she came and worshipped him, saying, Lord, help me," and even humbled her pride enough for her to apply his drastic figure to herself and strip herself of all that stood between her heart and him.

The shout of the multitude and of children along the way from Bethphage to Jerusalem [1] at the triumphal entry proclaimed him, "Son of David," and to the indignant rebuke of the scribes Jesus replied by a quotation from the Eighth Psalm, so as to imply his full approval of the song they sang. Jesus also used the title to confound the Pharisees as to the Messiah.[2] From these and parallel passages it may be inferred that Jesus did not set any value upon this title. It was too much in keeping with the political and material aspirations of the Jews. It would have brought him into difficulty had he employed it freely. He never used it himself of himself, as far as we know, nor did he seek to guard it against assault as of significance for his cause.

The Fourth Gospel, of inestimable value in bringing to us knowledge of the developing thought concerning Jesus, is too remote in its

[1] Matt. 21: 9, 15. [2] Matt. 22: 42.

final form, and is too subject to the Philonic philosophy, to be trustworthy in tracing out the earliest tradition and the actual use of words and phrases by our Lord, especially the title Son of God.

CHAPTER IX

JESUS AS A TEACHER

Jesus left no written words, but his teaching was engraved upon human hearts. It was therefore always vitalized, and if we have not received as much as would have been our portion had he committed his thoughts to writing, we have a purer and more characteristic tradition than any written words could have conveyed. Nor have we any system of thought which we can ascribe to Jesus. He was not a maker of theologies nor a formulator of doctrines. His mind was so absorbed with the immediate needs of the men and women before and around him that he poured out his messages to them in the most vital and simple expression of his mind. His thought was clear but not organized into a system. It was both universal and profound, but poured into the molds at hand in common speech and familiar thought. It was not philosophically novel, for that would have savored of the schools, but all he said was characterized by a certain pregnancy which preserved his sayings

in men's minds. He did not try to convince the reason so much as to move the heart of man through the reason. His aim was always fixed upon the life rather than upon the intellect. No teacher ever made so profound an impression upon the world. Yet no one of the world's great teachers left so little of his own words, or seemed so careless of the form of his thought. He taught most truly by his life, and his words were in a sense casual and non-essential. Nevertheless in them lies truth not yet extracted, and suggestion of form and method of greatest value. The Gospels have preserved for us some samples of his teaching, to which we must give heed. We shall examine the content of his mind first, and then seek out the method of his teaching.

I. The Content of the Mind of Christ

We have the mind of Christ reflected to us from the occasional and very scrappy remnants of his teachings preserved by the early disciples and written out at length in the four Gospels. Although the medium through which they have passed must have discolored and altered them in many ways, there is so much of distinct and harmonious character to them that we can be reasonably assured that we have a considerable body of teachings which can be relied upon to

give us knowledge of the thought of Jesus upon many sides. We shall consider his attitude toward God, toward the Kingdom, toward man, toward nature, and toward current thought and opinion.

1. *His attitude toward God.* — The Fatherhood of God was the organic principle of his teaching. He had learned it in the experiences of his life, and by this truth he had been led into all other truth. Out of it were generated by natural processes his idea of the Kingdom, of man's place in the world, and of the world itself, God was his Father and the Father of all men. "My Father, and your Father," he said, with the same assurance that entered into the words, "My God, and your God," to one who knew but one God.[1] Kinship with God and his fatherly care were the basal factors in his faith and in his message of love and confidence. He did not stop in any metaphysical union, but carried his relation out into the ethics of daily life. He himself was the Son of God, and all men ought to be.[2] God bears only a good will toward all, and calls them into his companionship (Matt. 5: 44–48).

The Old Testament gave Jesus abundant

[1] Matt. 5: 16, 44, 45; 6: 26; 11: 27; 23: 9; Mark 1: 11; 11: 25. [2] Luke 15: 19; Matt. 5: 45; John 1: 12.

foundation for this thought.[1] It lay there undeveloped and unappreciated until he took it up and through his experience made it dominant in his life and teaching. The common thought of his own day had so far removed God from human contact or interest that there was no idea of a vital relationship between the race and its Creator. To overthrow this settled conviction and supplant it with the glowing affection and close attachment of a family connection, was the bold and innovating purpose of Jesus. Only the utmost confidence in his own status with the Father could have enabled him to venture upon so revolutionary a course. Only the vital truth in his message made it possible of any realization. And he did not compromise in his interpretation of Fatherhood. It was a true love-relation, seeking the response of love. Obedience as the sign of response, and the communion with the Father in exalted harmony, must follow. He did not in the least decrease the exaltation of God as supreme in his holiness, but he opened up to man the chance of sharing in the nobility of his character.

2. *The attitude of Jesus toward the Kingdom.* — The idea of the Kingdom in the mind of Jesus depended closely upon his idea of God and his

[1] Isa. 63: 16; Mal. 1: 6; Hos. 2: 1; Jer. 31: 9, 20.

personal relation to the Father, out from which all his more formal teachings flowed. It is safe to say that these were characteristic ideas: (*a*) It was not a political but a spiritual Kingdom. His nation had always clung to the political ideal as essential to the spiritual. It was characteristic of Jesus that he turned the other way, and used the political only as a servant of the inner state. He defined each clearly, and differentiated them in his mind. "The Kingdom of God is within you," he told his followers, and himself relied upon no chance of earthly power or organized force. (*b*) He probably used the current phrase "kingdom of heaven" in the sense that it was of a heavenly character and belonged to the sphere of thought where God rules supreme. (*c*) He united in one conception the apocalyptic message of a future Kingdom and the demand for immediate relief of those who waited for the consolations of Israel, producing a new and larger realm of immediate presence in that unbounded world of spiritual existence, which to him was not separated from life here, but was continuous with, and indivisible from, our earthly life. (*d*) Thus he was not exclusively eschatological, nor was he entirely ethical in his teachings about the Kingdom. He was both. He was eschatological in looking to the future for the realization

in its majesty of his ideal, and he was ethical in his insistence upon the principles, the practise of which was to bring the Kingdom in on earth. Neither the fifth chapter of Matthew nor the thirteenth chapter of Mark can be set apart alone as representative. Both belong in his picture of the ideal Kingdom. But both must be interpreted from his spiritual standpoint, and seen through the medium of his close touch with his Father in perfect love. Neither one can be taken literally, for both have their poetic elements. (*e*) This Kingdom was to grow from small beginnings, and was to become universal. He began his ministry preaching, not himself, but the Kingdom. He is reported by Mark as bringing "The gospel of the kingdom of God."[1] He recognized a preparation for it in the past, a consecution in history in which he and his message were to be but a link. "The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand: repent ye, and believe the gospel."[2] To this end he demanded a moral preparation in repentance, and a special life-relation to it in a committing faith that was to ally all conduct with it henceforth. Most of his teaching was an expounding of this new and startling idea, with exhortation to men to enter

[1] Mark 1: 14. [2] Mark 1: 15.

into that for which they had long waited. Here he joined himself most closely to his people and current aspirations, while lifting thought and stimulating ideas and touching life as the old Jewish notion had failed to do.

3. *His attitude toward man.* — Jesus recognized and emphasized the value of man as no other teacher has ever done. He looked upon all men as at least potentially the children of God. As such they were beyond price.[1] A single soul is worth the whole world.[2] Matter cannot stand in comparison with him, nor all good things.[3] For this reason rebellion against God, the refusal of the divine rights of the soul through sin, is a most terrible thing.[4] It was his especial mission to rescue such as were thus being lost, and to restore them to their Father's house. He was called the friend of publicans and sinners.[5] He never seems to have despaired of any man. There was always hope for the worst and the weakest of them. Society he did not divide up into two classes distinct from each other, the one class good, the other evil. In fact, he discovered that those most open to his appeals were precisely those who were usually condemned as "sinners,"

[1] Mark 8: 36, 37; Matt. 16: 26.
[2] Luke 9: 25.
[3] Matt. 6: 25; Luke 12: 15–21.
[4] Matt. 5: 21, 22.
[5] Matt. 11: 19.

and the most impervious to truth as he taught it were those who prided themselves upon being among the good. He called all sorts to him, and treated all alike as needing the spirit which he inculcated with his truth. Little children he would in no wise shut out [1] and all men, he taught, were to be assumed to be immortal, because they were made in the spiritual image of God.[2] He spoke to the heart rather than to the intellect, and in full simplicity for the common man. As to his psychology, he assumed that of his day to be correct enough. Life belongs to the *psyche* which is separate from but resident within the body, which man at all hazards must preserve and improve, for it is eternal.[3] The two words *life* and *psyche* seem practically synonymous. The spiritual nature he signified by the term heart. It is an inclusive word for reason, feeling, and will. The divine power in man is sometimes represented by the Greek word pneuma.[4] Jesus held that, after this life, departed spirits are conscious, and he spoke of the current belief in two separate abodes of the dead several times without contradiction or change.[5]

[1] Mark 9: 37; 10: 14, 15. [2] Mark 12: 18 ff.
[3] Matt. 6: 25; 10: 28; Luke 12: 19, 20.
[4] Mark 14: 38; Luke 23: 46; John 4: 23 ff.
[5] Matt. 25; Luke 16: 22 ff.

4. *His attitude toward nature.* — Like every seer, Jesus had a peculiarly close sympathy with nature. Amos reflects the spirit and life of his barren hill-country above the Dead Sea in his prophecies, Isaiah feels the pulse of nature beating with his own, and Ezekiel takes on something of the tone of his surroundings by the river Chebar. Above them all, Jesus found an affinity subtle and refined but very real, in every aspect of nature that presented itself to him. He had the poetic instinct by which he saw the hand of God made manifest in passing seasons and all the phenomena of life. He heard the silent voices of winds and waters, and the music of the stars. He was himself a part of all that happened, and identified himself with the ongoings of the majestic course of the year. He loved nature because of its beauty and strength. He was a keen observer. Little things did not escape his eye. The fields and the hills were familiar to him. He was not born or reared in city walls, but out beneath the skies in the free air of heaven.

All nature was a revelation to his soul. In every vital process God appeared to him. "Your heavenly Father feedeth them," he said of the sparrows. In a lily in the grass he found proof of the goodness of God and his love of beauty for its own sake. He first understood that

"beauty is its own excuse for being," because it is a joy and a delight to God and to his open-eyed children. It may be that Jesus came nearer to our modern conception of animate nature than his contemporaries, for it seemed all instinct with his Father's spirit and alive with his fostering care. It gave him spiritual refreshment, when he escaped from men and all that man had made, to spend hours or entire nights alone with God in the midst of his fresh creation, separated from him only by the thin garment of living things. He had considered the lilies, and like them had learned to receive what God gave and to grow thereby, rejecting the useless and harmful while he assimilated the nourishing and the wholesome.

Jesus added nothing to our knowledge of the natural world. His attitude could not have been that of the scientist. He looked not so much at things as through them. He sought not the method of their being but the message they brought from the Creator. He did not get caught in the modern problems of the overplus of blossoms, and note how nature ravins red in tooth and claw. He saw the kindlier side of life, and felt the sacredness of growth, a testimony to the worth of man whom all things serve. For to him nature was never an end in

itself, but ever a means of higher life. The Greeks fell into the habit of adoring the inanimate thing of beauty. Jesus always beheld in it a way into the temple's holier presence, which unseen must be adored. Man was always above nature, and God over all. Nature was to be used for the good of man, and he was to find in it the simplest book of God's love.

Anything like the modern conception of natural law was far from the mind of Jesus. He saw an immediate connection of God with life and all creative forces, and believed that God could and did act directly upon and in nature to produce effects. The idea of the times was, that God controlled all things through his ministering spirits, and Jesus gives no sign of having departed from it, excepting that he eliminated angelic mediaries and brought God and the world together. As a faithful Son he acted in accordance with this belief, and expected that God would work for and with him in nature, in accordance with the divine wisdom and for the highest interests of men. Whatever was mysterious he referred to the working of God immediately, or possibly to the baleful operations of evil spirits seeking to antagonize God and do harm to men. Any other conception as to natural forces would have been incomprehensible

to his followers, and indeed was incomprehensible even after Christianity had been established on the earth for many centuries. Yet the simple faith of Jesus in the constant presence and activity of his Father in all things was really very close to the modern Christian pantheism so widely held throughout the world. The outcome of a reasoned faith in harmony with modern science turns back to the point of view of Him who said, "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work."

5. *His attitude toward current thought and opinions.* — Jesus was a child of his time and race, as far as mental equipment is concerned. He never claimed any superior intelligence, as to history or science or any of the realms of scholarship. His mind was acute and active. But he did not set himself up as an authority upon any debated questions of the schools. He was a master in religion, and never hesitated to stand as such in the province of the soul and all its interests. He openly confessed that to him as to others the minor matters of time and things were concealed, while he gave his undivided attention to the affairs of eternity. The current views he would have adopted as a matter of necessity, that he might not be excluded from intercourse with his neighbors. Toward the state and all questions of law he adopted the rule

of obedience, save where, as in the exactions of the scribes, law transgressed the rights of his free conscience. So superior was he in mind to the petty quibbles about forms and details, that he had no eye for them, and with amazement and pity realized how large they bulked in the minds of many of his generation who tithed mint and anise and cummin. Questions of Jewish history he had no time to investigate, but adopted current theories. If he ever heard the question raised as to who wrote the Jewish Scriptures, he did not attempt to discuss it, for what had that to do with his mission in the world? Will any one be saved or lost by their belief as to the authors of a book? He spoke, like every one else, according to the current opinion. We do not know of a single simply intellectual issue raised by Jesus, nor of one single opinion of his upon subjects in the field of pure intellect. He was single-minded in his prosecution of a greater mission. When he spoke incidentally of "the Book of Moses" [1] or prefaced a quotation with the words "David himself said," [2] he gave no authority for quoting him in a modern discussion as to authorship of certain books. So too in his reference to Jonah,[3] to Satan,[4] and evil spirits,[5]

[1] Mark 12: 26.
[2] Mark 12: 36.
[3] Matt. 12: 41, 42; Luke 11: 29–32.
[4] Matt. 4: 10.
[5] Matt. 12: 43–45.

and many other matters of changing opinion without importance to the soul of man. Physical science, literary criticism, theology even, were not matters of great concern with Jesus. They did not present themselves as questions for solution to his mind, or else he felt them to be of such minor import that he did not pronounce upon them. "He spoke in pictures, not in syllogisms."[1]

When we come to the sphere of religion, in which Jesus may with all reverence be called a genius, he did not hesitate to differ widely from his times and all times. He connected himself closely with the prophets of the Old Testament, and developed prophetic spirit in distinction from priestly offices. He did not have much patience with the ritual of the temple or the requirements of the law. And he took advanced ground upon certain current issues. He denied the efficacy of fasting as his formal countrymen practised it.[2] He could not endure the tyranny of the institutionalism which made the Sabbath a barren, inhuman day.[3] The nice discrimination between clean and unclean, according to established laws of great complexity, he would not tolerate.[4] And as to sacrifice, which many

[1] Muirhead.
[2] Mark 2: 18, 19; Matt. 6: 16–18.
[3] Matt. 12: 12; Mark 2: 23 ff. [4] Mark 7: 15–19.

Christian scholars have made the nearest point of contact of the Jewish with the Christian faith, Jesus repudiated it as an unwarranted rite, wherever mercy and righteousness and the sacrifice of a humble and contrite heart were wanting, and useless when these were present.[1] He was strikingly original in his religious teachings, because he was so simple and so sure that his positions were true and ample. The antagonism of institutionalism was inevitable for one so individualistic and spiritual, but he was as simple in the statement of his faith as in its content, and as bold in proclaiming it as he was assured that it was ultimate, and came from God directly to his soul. At first his utterances, falling upon the ears of the common people whose hearts were tender, and in Galilee where the priest had no such firm control, did not rouse so much opposition as at a later day when priest and Pharisee confronted him. "The common people heard him gladly." The institutions and their defenders were scandalized at the bare simplicity of his teaching, and fought him for their life.

II. The Method of His Teaching

His intimate consciousness of God made Jesus keen for truth everywhere and always. He

[1] Matt. 9: 13; 12: 7; Mark 12: 28–34.

dwelt in the real, and reality was essential to all his thinking. Hence his teaching was not so much negative as positive. The entire teaching of his people was based upon the method of negation. "Thou shalt not" was the sum and substance of it. Jesus based his message upon the positive side of truth, which is the method of robustness, as negation is the act of a weakened intellect.[1] He was not attempting to exclude, but to include. He came not to destroy, but to fulfil, both the partial law of negation and the wide reaches of life. He spoke as one who knew whereof he spoke. He was convinced that he uttered the will of God in all purity and vital completeness. Hence he had to speak positively and with authority.

He seems to have employed several forms of speech in teaching, which have their significance in the study of his development, and also give hints of pedagogical values. He adopted the long-tried methods of the wise rabbis, of sententious sayings and epigrammatic expressions that possess a bur-like propensity to stick to the mind. He often resorted to paradox and hyperbole to make men think. One common phrase he used in introducing a lesson or sermon was,

[1] "A man is usually right in his affirmations, and wrong in his negations." — F. D. Maurice.

"What think ye?" Again, he taught by his own outward act, as in the washing of his disciples' feet, or by the action of others which he had induced or singled out as a lesson for them. Many of his miracles were lessons taught in this graphic style, parables in deed. But the most striking method of teaching he employed was that of parables. Here again he adopted a common method of his people, but so far did he excel them all, that he stands out preeminent among the teachers of the world as a maker of parables to serve as vehicles of truth. Nothing is more certain in all tradition than that we have the originals of at least many of the parables attributed to him in the Gospels. Through them we approach with assurance the inner life and the actual mind of Christ.

What pedagogical art did Jesus practise, if indeed he was either consciously or unconsciously seeking to employ the best methods in his teaching? From the fact that the world's best teachers have never ceased to revert to him, and still find in his meager lessons preserved to us a mine of information and suggestion regarding their art and craft, it seems impossible to deny that Jesus did, either consciously or unconsciously, use the greatest skill in his work. His country was overrun with Pharisees, who sought with unquench-

able zeal to establish schools of the law in every town and village, and in every tongue and dialect. They had made teaching their special vocation for two hundred years. Like the Jesuits in the sixteenth century in Europe, they were masters of the art according to their purposes. Jesus came in contact with them from his youth. He studied their ways more and more as he grew into consciousness that in him the truth was planted which his people needed to hear. When at last he began his task after his baptism, it is at least probable that he had given much careful thought to the manner of putting truth. He began where his hearers stood, in the popular idea of the Kingdom. In truth, his first gospel seems a mere echo of that of John the Baptist. And he used the forceful, striking method of epigram to shoot his truth like arrows into the minds and hearts of his hearers. Matthew evidently had the proper ear for words, and a mind for word-values, which has made him the channel through which have come down to us so many of the pointed sayings of Jesus, and Mark's sketchy style is peculiarly adapted to these word-pictures. Crisp phrases startled sluggish minds and jostled them out of the ruts of tradition. They are the most marked characteristic of the earlier teaching of Jesus, as far as we

are warranted in arranging what we have in sequence of time. He had first the task of awaking the minds and reaching the hearts of his hearers; then he could give them instruction. Had he begun with the stories of his Kingdom, they would have been wasted upon ears that heard not, and eyes that saw not would have failed to take in the pictures he spread before them.

The parables came later in the ministry of Jesus. They are called the vehicles for conveying to the people "the mysteries of the kingdom."[1] They are frequently introduced with the phrase "The kingdom of heaven is." They were useful only to those who had some insight into truth as Jesus saw it. At the same time they embody truth in such a way that it abides and often unfolds itself gradually, even when the mind has retained them long for their simple interest or beauty.

Quite as striking to modern students as his words is the reticence of Jesus. We have at best only partial glimpses of his teaching, but this silence when one would expect speech seems a part of his method rather than a lack of correct and full reporting. He had an evident purpose in restraining speech concerning himself from

[1] Matt. 13: 11.

the first. He kept his person in the background, and set forth the Kingdom, with the purpose to gain contact with current thinking and to lead the people from the known and general to the unknown and particular. He cautioned those he healed against telling of the cure.[1] All such cautions and precautions cease at the event which brought out the apostles' confession in Peter's words at Cæsarea Philippi. From that day on there was no further need of secrecy. His entire relation to the apostles and to the people and to his mission changed.

This reticence of his was not due to any feeling of the inadequacy of the Messianic title to express what he felt within his soul. It was rather to avoid misconceptions based upon the popular ideal of a marvelous king sent full-grown from heaven with bloody sword and mighty mien to conquer Rome and establish judgment on the earth. So easily inflamed was the public temper that it would have been easy to precipitate an insurrection which he could neither control nor approve. He had to create an atmosphere first of all. The difficulty he had in establishing his own disciple-group in the new ideas after Cæsarea Philippi is evidence enough to show how needful his tact of silence was.

[1] Mark 1: 44; 3: 12; 5: 43; 7: 36; 8: 26, 30.

Teaching by action was more in evidence toward the end of his ministry than earlier, because by that time his spirit was better understood, and it was possible to interpret his deeds in the light of experience. The triumphal entry into Jerusalem was doubtless a pedagogical act, although it was in no sense a bid for popular action in rescuing him and his doomed cause from defeat. He emphasized in it the very characteristics which he had been insisting upon as essential features of the Messianic Kingdom. Peace, not war; humility, not pride; gentleness, not force; joy, not grief; and above all, the spiritual over against the earthly life; these things he suggested graphically as he rode into the city. The cleansing of the temple was not done for its own sake so much as to teach men one more great lesson of reverence and right relation to God, with sweeping condemnation of the materialism which turns everything holy or profane to gain. Not that Jesus in the least degree was a "poseur" and a calculating actor or planner of dramatic situations. Such an attitude toward life was the farthest possible from his mind. It was all full of intense meaning, and everything had ultimate spiritual bearings. He related all things to his one end of accomplishing the introduction of the Kingdom

on the earth into the hearts of men. Thus every opportunity to speak or act for the enforcement of his message he was obliged to employ. To this extent his method was pedagogical, and the enduring success of his short ministry and exceedingly brief and scrappy literary remains is due to this dominant purpose and the working of it out with all the skill he could muster.

There is a sense in which Jesus was rhetorical in his delivery of the message he gave. He was a man of supreme eloquence. Whatever would make his presentation of the gospel more effective, whether by beauty or by force or by simplicity, which is the soul of eloquence, he carefully cultivated or instinctively adopted with the unerring insight of genius. "Never man spake like this man," we may be sure. His public speech must have been both winning and impressive. He courted beauty in it, and dressed it with living pictures from all familiar sights around him. The gift of nature to his language, and the drapery of his thought gathered from landscapes and common life, are remarkable. He had a rich fancy which he did not restrain unduly. He had also an acute judgment, which he exercised to the full. With what masterly skill did he select themes and illustrations for his auditors! He was bold in denunciation and

tender in sympathy, quick in apprehension and strong in reassurance. Out of his own heart he appealed to other hearts of like experience. The life he lived can be painted from the revelations he makes in his words to others. And all is kept steadily within the range of reality by his perfect sanity and his constant reference to the familiar as a gateway into the things beyond. The peasant life of Galilee affords him a rich sphere for his thought to work in. The little house of one room where the lamp set upon the overturned measure gives the evening light; the fields without clothed in the beauty of grass and flowers; the birds of the air, the lilies of the field, the seed of the sower, and the entire round of homely duties of farm and house; little children, merchants, soldiers, priests, every phase of life, and every rank and order of society he touched with his light and enlightening touch. The contrast has been made by Bossuet between the illustrations used by Paul and those of Jesus, to indicate the contrast in mind between the two. The one called upon the common experience of common men and women and even children, in a fine simplicity which makes his teaching live forever. The other relied upon temple and forum, the teaching of the schools and the abstruse methods of the theologians, so that it is

difficult to understand where he is expressing what to him is universal truth, and where he is illustrating a passing phase of it; and the doctrine of Paul does not serve the same purpose as the teaching of Jesus which it was intended to explain.

Jesus manifested greatest courage in his teaching. He attacked with boldness the oppressor and the false teacher, wherever he met them or uncovered their work. With the very spirit of Amos and Jeremiah he impeached them for pretense, formalism, self-content, and perversion of office for selfish ends. At the same time he manifested greatest compassion for the multitude and identified himself with those he sought to help. He was nearer to the popular tradition than to the tradition of the schools, nearer to those who lived by heart than to those whose pride of life was in their mental culture. Yet he was not a teacher with any conscious principles of pedagogy, committed to a system laid down in a treatise. He was too spontaneous for that, and his words were too free and his thought was too unsystematic. He was a prophet, and out of his own experience he taught, as his own genius gave him utterance.

Many of the most characteristic words preserved to us, naturally enough, were first spoken to individuals. He was ever accessible to those

who needed him. And yet none of these private conversations is exhausted in its first application, but contains vital elements which make it still serviceable. He was so eager to meet each personal need that he established types of experience which are universally repeated, and his treatment is equally salutary for all. Ethics has been called the practise of the universal. The ethical quality in the teaching of Jesus gave it breadth and permanence. "The universal applicability of the gospel," said Paulsen,[1] "proceeds from the fact that it is not a philosophical nor a theological system. Systems pass away, . . . but great poems are as eternal as their subject, human life itself."

Something must be said about the use of words by Jesus, for he had a high regard for language as a revelation, and evidently employed words with care. Every idle word, he taught, must be accounted for unto God, "for by thy words thou shalt be justified, and by thy words thou shalt be condemned." "Out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh."[2] "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away." The man who hears and does according to the words of Jesus shall be likened to a wise man building upon a rock.[3] He

[1] Ethik, p. 72. [2] Matt. 12: 34ff. [3] Matt. 7: 24ff.

declared that he alone was the Teacher over them, and all they were brethren.[1] The Fourth Gospel has seven such references to his words as significant and of the greatest import.[2] He insisted that his followers simplify their conversation,[3] and he set them an example in the sincerity and the clarity of his speech, which made the people say of him that he did not put the truth as did the scribes, but with a certain authority born of conviction and increased by a common human basis felt by all.

The parables of Jesus were stories drawn from nature, either human or physical, in which he took up a common incident or fact and developed out of it a truth that is a rule of life; or else they were drawn from his teeming fancy where he wrought with artistic skill and higher realism, according to his purpose or necessity. In the parables was the consummation of his art, and the deepest revelation of his soul. They contain the teaching which he regarded to be of utmost importance, his maturest thought.

Parables like those of the Prodigal Son and the Good Samaritan are richer in both human and theological significance than even the ethical

[1] Matt. 23: 8.
[2] John 6: 68; 8: 31, 51; 12: 48; 14: 23, 24; 15: 3.
[3] Matt. 5: 37.

beauties of the Sermon on the Mount. But Jesus had a pedagogical motive in the order in which he used them. First he sought conduct, later life itself. His earlier teaching was taken up with the facts of the Kingdom, while there was more in his later discourse concerning his person and the idea of God. But everywhere there was a simplicity which is innocent of craft or system, and which led Pascal to say, "Jesus Christ speaks the greatest things so simply that it seems as if he had never thought upon them."[1]

The contribution to the world made by Jesus as a teacher is large and real, but who can state it in set phrases or measure it by any known canons of the schools? The substance of it cannot be found in aphorisms, beatitudes, or parables, but in the Teacher himself. It has furnished every educational reformer from Comenius to Pestalozzi with the essence of his new appeal for a larger use of personality and a fuller consecration of the spiritual forces needed in the teacher's art. If Jesus brought no new truths to flash upon the world their brilliant light, nor any novel methods, he reached the hearts and lives of his disciples, and by them the life of all mankind, through the high example and the moving passion of his life and death.

[1] Pensées et Lettres, II, 319.

CHAPTER X

THE MIRACLES AND ATTITUDE OF JESUS

A UNIVERSE harmoniously ordered under law is the glory of the thought of our day. Science lays down such a conception as fundamental, and religion is prepared to agree with science. For it is the tendency of modern Christianity to regard the universe as the cosmic revelation of God who is immanent therein. There is no warfare between science and religion. They look out from different standpoints upon the same scene and interpret the same phenomena with different purpose. The one finds in nature the immanent God at work; the other investigates the ways of his working. One seeks the cause; the other deals with methods. A man can therefore be scientist and Christian, for he can pronounce both the word God and the term Nature, and each will supplement the other in his thought.

The orthodox division of the world into natural and supernatural can no longer be maintained. A new and better orthodoxy has been established, in which we recognize all things as constituting

not a dualism, but a Universe. This generation will not be satisfied with a treatment of the person of Jesus which leaves him possessed of two natures, and makes of him a curiosity. Nor can we think of his ministry as filled with actions which are unaccountable and other-worldly. As he takes his place in history, so he takes his place in humanity, and must be known and analyzed as we know any other character. But this is not by any means to reduce our conception of the universe to a crass materialism, nor to deny a genuine divinity to Jesus Christ. On the contrary, it is the sublimation of the spiritual with which the universe is instinct, and of which it is all and everywhere the expression; it is the assertion of a divine life in the race, in every member of it, but extraordinary in Jesus Christ.

Once men believed in Christ because they believed in miracles. Now, they believe the miracles because they believe in Christ. They find miracles the natural expression of an extraordinary Person, harmonizing action in the physical world with that in the moral realm. Miracles are no longer thought of as contradictions or interruptions of natural processes from without, but rather as the working out in nature of higher and permanent laws of reason and the moral order. They are not to be treated on the physi-

cal plane, but in the sphere of personality, which always transcends nature. They belong to freedom and the will, not to necessity and matter. "A miracle," said Hume, "is no contradiction to the law of cause and effect; it is a new effect supposed to be produced by the introduction of a new cause." And Christianity insists upon causation as originating in a person. Wherever persons appear in the natural order, a free acting agent appears, with power to introduce new causes. And these causes must be measured by the personality introduced. "Given, in short, the Person of Christ," wrote Fairbairn,[1] "and it is more natural that he should, than that he should not, work miracles; they become the proper and spontaneous manifestations, the organic outcome or revelation, of his actual or realized being. Our supernatural was his natural; what we call his miracles were but the moral expressions of his energy, as nature is but the manifested activity, of the immanent God."

The psychological faculty may claim as its peculiar lot the entire realm of miracle. It is the result of exceptional personality coming into contact with nature. Thomas Hill Green of Oxford declared that the self-conscious will "is not natural in the ordinary sense of the term."

[1] Studies in the Life of Christ, p. 153.

It is no interruption of the uniformity of events to have this free will acting in nature to change and traverse and direct its forces. And given a perfect human will, in full harmony with God, then the action of this will cannot be an interference with natural law and the orderly sequence of events, even when this will brings to pass exceptional occurrences. It does not seem unscientific, therefore, to admit the possibility of miracles in the life of Jesus, as effects in nature which neither physical forces nor ordinary men are adequate to bring about. There was normally about him a spontaneous activity in the use of psychical powers which must have produced results that seemed to his contemporaries to be supernatural, as they indeed were preternatural, because he was a man developed to the height of his humanity. His followers came thus to think that Jesus could do anything, as a child believes that his father can mend any broken toy or restore an outworn tool or heal all wounds.

We must deliver the character of Jesus at all costs from the magical rôle which it was natural and indeed necessary for his disciples and their successors to assign to him, but which he seems to have refused to assume for himself. They saw such a character as the only possible part to be played by one who was the Son of God, the

Messiah, and consequently they painted every possible element in his activity in supernatural colors. We, on the contrary, realize that law, not its infraction, is the sign of God's presence, and we are driven to the task of bringing all the reported miracles of Jesus into orderly relation to laws, either known, or unknown but postulated. The necessity is forced upon us by the very laws of thought and the prevailing temper of our times. This process is not a lessening of spiritual quality, but an extension of it to regions where it was shut out by assumptions which were wedded forever to mystery and the unrelated, but which must give place to related knowledge.

Let us ask first what idea Jesus had as to himself with regard to any unusual powers; what he conceived his relationship to be to God; and what attitude he took toward miracles. After examining the miracles he is reported to have wrought, we can draw our conclusions as to his relation to the extraordinary occurrences which undoubtedly took place during his ministry.

1. *The idea of Jesus as to himself.* — Jesus always regarded himself as superior in his official ministry to the prophets. Jonah or Solomon were not comparable to him; he was greater than these.[1] He was conscious of being greater

[1] Matt. 11: 41, 42; Luke 11: 31, 32.

than the temple or the law or any institution of men. He gave himself generously to his disciples always, but there was a certain restraint and claim of superiority which they felt,[1] as appears not only in the Synoptists but even more in John.[2] He declared himself superior also to Satan,[3] whose power he disestablished on earth and overthrew. He always assumed a peculiar intimacy with God as his portion,[4] and lived in constant communion with him.[5] The Gospel of John abounds in references to this God-consciousness of Jesus. There it is developed into a metaphysical union, but in the earlier Gospels the groundwork for it is laid in the simple narrative of his withdrawal into solitude for prayer.[6] "And he spake a parable unto them to this end, that men ought always to pray, and not to faint.[7] It was the inmost support of his life. The cry upon the cross, "My God, why hast thou forsaken me?" expressed the very worst possible condition of life for him, and meant indeed the loss of life, because his forces drew constantly

[1] Matt. 10: 24, 25; 23: 10; Luke 6: 40.
[2] John 13: 12–16.
[3] Matt. 12: 26; Mark 3: 23–27.
[4] Matt. 11: 27; Luke 10: 22.
[5] Mark 1: 35; 6: 46; 14: 32-42.
[6] Luke 3: 21; 5: 16; 6: 12; 9: 18, 28; 11: 1.
[7] Luke 18: 1.

upon God. He undertook his mission as the elect of God, and felt himself the representative of the Father without whom he could do nothing.

2. *The idea of Jesus as to the power of God in him.* — God was as real, and as personal, to Jesus, as his mother Mary was in the humble home in Nazareth. As a child he "must be about his Father's business," and as a man he had no other occupation. With his conception that things were immediately in the hands of his Father, he must have felt every possibility suggested in the Temptation, and in his mind he cherished the sense of supernatural power. No system of natural laws or fixed processes stood between him and the immediate activity of his Father. "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work." [1] So at one were they in purpose and in power that his disciples are warranted in putting into his lips such bold words as these: "I and my Father are one." [2] He assured his captors in the last hours that they should see him sitting on the right hand of power.[3] It was the place he was conscious of occupying continually, even here on earth.

3. *The idea of Jesus as to miracles.* — That Jesus held the current opinion regarding miracles

[1] John 5: 17. [2] John 10: 30. [3] Mark 14: 62.

as attendant upon the Messiah and characteristic of his coming is probable. But his own nature was too fine in quality and too spiritual in its grasp to permit him to rely upon any supernatural signs to prove his identity or to win followers. That was settled at the beginning, in his struggle pictured in the Temptation. When men called for signs he rebuked them, and declared the request to be based upon false assumptions.[1] His only "sign" was preaching like Jonah's. That was a greater work in his sight than all his miracles, and he named it as the climax in his reply to the disciples of John when their master sent them to reassure his faith.[2] He absolutely refused to use whatever miraculous power he had to establish himself in authority over the popular credulity.

Again, he could not exert the same influence always upon others, nor accomplish the same results always. He could not do mighty works in Nazareth, for instance, because of unbelief. Psychical conditions must be favorable to the exercise of his gifts.[3] Now and then, as in Luke 5: 17, behind the text arises the assumption that there were times when the power of the Lord was not present to heal.

[1] Matt. 16: 1–4; Mark 8: 11 ff; Luke 11: 29.
[2] Luke 7: 22. [3] Matt. 13: 58; Mark 6: 5 ff.

In another passage,[1] Jesus suggested that the working of a miracle was for him a harder thing to do than to forgive the sins of a man. He found it, as it were, less an object of his ministry, a by-product aside from the main course of his life and thought. Yet there was a certain spontaneity of his miraculous action, as if it were the natural outlet of his sympathy and love.

Healing Jesus certainly did in wonderful ways. It was a part of the profession of the rabbi to heal the sick. It was a matter of spiritual rather than physical treatment, for the Jews believed that disease frequently, if not always, was a result of sin, or a punishment for it.[2] The demons all about were constantly bringing in disease, and he who could remove sin could deliver from sickness; he who could drive out demons was able to release the possessed. The Greek δαιμόνιον occurs about sixty times in the New Testament. The belief in such creatures had wide currency in the two centuries adjacent to the birth of Christ, through Parsee and Greek influence. We can form no adequate idea of the important part played by them in the religious life of the times. Evidently Luke saw in the power of Jesus to cast out demons[3] a chief sign

[1] Luke 5: 23.
[2] See Chapter II, p. 41.
[3] Luke 13: 32; 11: 20.

of his Messiahship. It was believed that the entire kingdom of evil was made subject to him,[1] and the devil and his angels were to be destroyed.[2] Jesus himself looked upon Satan and his demons as holding in usurpation a portion of his realm from which he must cast them out.[3] When he found the seventy returning with joy to report their mastery of evil spirits, he beheld Satan fallen as lightning from his throne.[4]

It was a common practise by exorcism to cast out demons. Josephus[5] reports that Solomon composed incantations for relieving disease, and forms of exorcism for casting out demons. He adds, "Even to the present day this mode of cure prevails among us to a very great extent." Jesus admitted that the Pharisees cast out devils,[6] and that certain ones who were not of his own following did so in his name. But his own cures seem to have surprised the people, because they were so free from the exorcist's art and practise. He preached and healed, in a broad ministry to suffering humanity. His emphasis was always upon sin and the cure of it, even in the report of his ministry as given by those who saw the material first; but wherever he found men

[1] Luke 10: 18ff. [2] Mark 1: 24; Matt. 8: 29.
[3] Luke 11: 20. [4] Luke 10: 18.
[5] Ant. VIII, 2, 5; Bel. Jud. VII, 6, 3. [6] Matt. 12: 27.

afflicted with disease, he seems to have lavished his curing ministry upon them in compassion. The cases of demoniacal possession narrated in the Gospels all appear to be cases which we would class as psychical or physical. They were diseased minds, which we treat under the names insanity, epilepsy, etc. Sometimes possession and the speaking with tongues appear like types of alternate personality.

Over these unfortunates Jesus had a peculiar power. He commanded the demons to speak or not to speak; he ordered the paralyzed to arise; the blind to open their eyes; the deaf ears to open; and the evil spirits to depart from those who were supposed to be tormented by them. Under the spell of his personality the patient sufferers were relieved, and restored to their right minds. No wonder that the writer of Acts 10: 38 summed up the activity of Jesus in these words: "Who went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the devil; for God was with him." It was hardly necessary for "the imagination of the faithful" to "deck the form of Christ with a rich garland of miracle."[1] He did himself weave such a garland, and the gratitude of those who were healed by him adorned his name with it. Myth and legend

[1] Pfleiderer.

have done their inevitable work in the Gospels, as in all history of exceptional personalities, and it is in no way discreditable to the New Testament, nor derogatory to the character of Jesus, to confess it. Not this, but the fact that there is so little of the legendary and mythical element in the Gospels, is the striking characteristic of the story of Jesus. He did not set so high a value upon the miracle as a sign as his age did. He never yielded to the temptation to degenerate in the use of it. No self-service, no special privileges, no short-circuiting in his life's momentous task, did he once allow. There are few miracles of Jesus, and there are none of the lurid and flamboyant tales which cluster around the names of St. Augustine and St. Francis and many another lesser follower of the Nazarene. Of the former, four hundred miracles are told; of the latter, twelve hundred. In 1906, Father Seraphim was canonized in Russia and accredited with no less than ninety-four miracles. Of Jesus, thirty-six at the utmost are named. The restraint of the Gospels is in contrast to the theology that places Jesus in an atmosphere of magic and sets the miraculous at the forefront of his career as the strongest proof of his divine mission to the race.

Everywhere the works he did were actuated

by emotions of pity and love. His powers were exerted to help his preaching of the gospel of salvation from sin, and to relieve necessity or suffering. Even the three instances in which he is said to have raised the dead to life are told with a restraint and simplicity almost as remarkable as the incidents themselves. These facts cannot be overlooked in estimating the miraculous activity of Jesus, but they give the miracles a certain standing apart, where each must be judged by itself according to the evidence.

There are four Greek words in the Gospels for miracles, *σημεῖα*, *τέρατα*, *θαυμάσια*, *δυνάμεις*; signs, wonders, wonderful things, and mighty works. Jesus regarded miracles in this last sense, and the power to work them he never doubted as his inheritance from God. The other words convey a meaning more common in the Old Testament and in the sphere of the current Messianic thought. It was not pleasing to Jesus, to say the least,[1] and it may have been really painful,[2] to have the emphasis so universally placed upon that portion of his ministry which was subordinate in his mind, and wholly incidental. Mighty works are ascribed alike to

[1] Matt. 12: 39; 16: 4: John 4: 48; 10: 38; 14: 11.
[2] Mark 8: 12.

Jesus and to John,[1] and indeed to any one who seemed to use power for service in healing.[2] It was therefore not a Messianic qualification, but rather a more common rabbinic service which Jesus rendered in his mighty works. He depended upon conditions,[3] and knew that virtue had gone out of him when he healed.[4] He made his mighty works to serve as an appeal to repentance, like his preaching.[5] Rejecting the idea of proving his divinity by miracles, or of attracting attention to himself by them, he speaks of signs and wonders generally when using apocalyptic material,[6] and possibly also in the Fourth Gospel with reference to his resurrection,[7] although this passage is misplaced in time and misinterpreted as referring to his body.

The miracles of Jesus may be classified as miracles of healing, of mercy and of instruction. The science of medicine was not yet born, but was a crude empiricism, mingled intimately with cruder superstitions. Death was not considered insurmountable, but physical resurrection had become a popular hope in connection with the apocalyptic Messianic expectation.

[1] Matt. 13: 54; 14: 2.
[2] Matt. 7: 22; Mark 9: 39.
[3] Matt. 13: 58: Mark 6: 5.
[4] Mark 5: 30.
[5] Matt. 11: 20ff.
[6] Luke 21: 11.
[7] John 2: 18, 19.

The old attempt to trace the miracles to an origin in parables has been revived of late, but it proves too much, in an age when science recognizes that there are many laws of natural life and personal touch with other persons and with nature which we have not yet mastered. Parabolic and other pedagogic accretions gathered about them, but there can be no doubt that Jesus healed the sick. An event which is a miracle to one person need not necessarily be one to another who has more knowledge or a wider experience. Hobbes in The Leviathan (chapter 27) pointed that out long ago. The very acts which Jesus performed, set in our day and surroundings, would not seem to any one miraculous, but rather as Jesus himself regarded them, mighty works of a mighty soul; wrought according to laws of personality not yet wholly known, but destined to be formulated and brought into common use.

The miracles of mercy, like the turning of water into wine, the calming of the storm, the feeding of the multitude and the raising of the dead, all lie in the realm of psychological possibility, and can be explained more easily as the work of a noble soul through suggestion and personal psychoses than as the twisting of parabolic sayings about the highly magnified per-

sonality of Jesus. Latitude must be given, of course, for the interpretation the age put upon events, and for an inevitable transference of accent from the realm of psychology to that of external occurrences. For the cure which we would account for as a matter of psychological influence, or the experience which we believe to be mediated through personality in the realm of mind, the Jews could not help objectifying and explaining according to the current faith in occult spiritual interruptions into nature. Here is the origin of legend, which becomes a magnifying-glass through which events grow with remarkable precision.

The miracles of instruction are numerous and suggestive of the pedagogic interest of Jesus. The withered fig-tree is one such, and others are the healing of the Syrophenician woman's daughter, and the boy at the foot of the Mount of Transfiguration. The stilling of the storm [1] and the walking on the water, if they were miraculous at all, and not mere psychical illusions, belong in this class, with the draught of fishes near Bethsaida. The raising of Lazarus, told by only one evangelist, and he the farthest removed from the event in time, yet has close relations with the resurrection story, and may be of pedagogic interest in the scheme of the teach-

[1] See J. Weiss, Das älteste Evangelium, p. 184ff.

ing of Jesus. Here if anywhere we find myth and legend, alleviating the pain of loss and the dread of death under the resurrection faith.

Of the entire thirty-six miracles narrated of Jesus, eight only are not miracles of healing, if we include under that head the raising of Lazarus and the widow's son at Nain. Of these eight, two may be, and probably are, duplicates of one occurrence, — the feeding of the multitude. That event, together with the turning of water into wine, the calming of the storm, and the walking on the water, is probably explicable upon a purely psychological basis, and has attached to itself certain parabolic interests of an allegorical suggestion. The miraculous draft of fishes, and the cursing of the fig-tree are explicable on the ground of the extremely acute and sensitive perception of nature that belonged to the make-up of Jesus, and the story of the stater is a way of telling how at his suggestion Peter returned for a day to his craft to earn the required tax. Thus it is possible to bring all the miracles attributed to Jesus into two classes, — his cures of sickness, even unto seeming death, and the acuteness of his psychical forces, which gave him great influence over men, which also gave him unusual sympathy with and penetration of nature.

As to the three narratives, the raising of Jairus' daughter from the dead in the Synoptists,[1] the raising of the widow's son at Nain in Luke,[2] and the raising of Lazarus in John,[3] it is distinctly reported in the first and the last instance that Jesus pronounced the seeming death to be sleep.[4] To be sure the wailers beside the maid's couch "laughed him to scorn, knowing that she was dead," and the Fourth Gospel is careful to explain the words as spoken of the death of Lazarus, and to add the words from Jesus' lips, "Lazarus is dead." This is enough to raise the question whether Jesus, by his keen insight and his intense sympathy with life, did not appreciate a distinction between actual dissolution and an apparent death which was rather related to coma or suspended animation, and which would result in death if the subject were not delivered from it. Even in this day we do not know what death is, and the wisest men use words to conceal their ignorance regarding it, while the gruesome history of mistakes in this region, which were discovered when too late, reveals to us how wide the field is, and how liable it was to be entered by

[1] Matt. 9: 18–26; Mark 5: 22–43; Luke 8: 41–56.
[2] Luke 7: 11–15.
[3] John 11: 1–44, assuming this to be literally true.
[4] Luke 8: 52; John 11: 11.

one whose apperception mass, in all that concerned life, was so acute as that of Jesus was. Until we have defined life and know more about death, we cannot say that Jesus could not have rescued these three persons from certain and premature doom.

Whether or no Jesus believed that he actually raised the dead, it seems certain that his contemporaries believed it, and so countless multitudes since have believed. In our modern thought of nature and natural law, there are two possible attitudes to be taken toward these three narratives, and they comport with the two positions open to us regarding the resurrection of Jesus himself. The first suits the mind of a conservative temper, and finds its refuge in the midst of the chaos now existing in thought upon matter and concerning death. What is matter? Mere pencils of force? An electrical phenomenon? A figment of the mind? And what is death? How absolute is it? Two persons are rescued from the water, both apparently dead. Restoratives are applied, and skilful manipulation of the bodies is resorted to. After hours, one lives, the other shows no signs of life. What is the difference? What was the difference when they were taken out of the water, both apparently drowned? Where does death begin?

— in the ovum? and where does it end? There is no definite answer to these questions yet, and until there is, no man has a scientific right to say that Jesus did not raise the dead to life again.

The second open door leads to a complete denial of the narratives as unauthentic romances, growing out of a mighty faith and a great affection, eager to glorify Jesus Christ. Or, they are regarded as spiritual parables, not intended to be taken literally by the writers, but gradually transferred from the didactic to the historical realm.

The first attitude relies upon the historicity of the narratives, and commits to the realm of the psychology of Jesus the phenomena, awaiting further light. The second, while denying historicity, accounts for the stories through the psychology of the race, as evidenced in history and tradition.

A spontaneous practise of self-expression, not a carefully studied and practised art, was that of Jesus, for we cannot conceive of one of his spirit and bearing going to Egypt, as his Jewish detractors said of him, to learn the necromancer's skill. It came to him as a gift from heaven, and was used under the direct influence of his Father whose will he ever sought to do. This atmosphere of spirituality rested over all his works, and kept them subordinate to the real

purpose of his life in teaching and inspiring men for the Kingdom of heaven. Not once did he do what people from Herod down demanded of him constantly; he would not perform great wonders for the gratification of curiosity or for the establishment of his claims by marvels. Differentiated from the necromancers of the East alike in purpose and in practise, he did what he did from a truly moral and religious motive, in a spirit as reverent and as ethically sound as that in which he taught the truth he believed.

Throughout this discussion of the miracles, I have tried to transfer the emphasis from the deed to the doer, from the marvelousness of events to the graciousness of Christ. There is no more significant index of the right attitude for the student to take toward the miraculous element in the Scriptures than can be found in the story of the Temptation. In that experience, as in every exercise of the personal power of Jesus, the one thing at stake is not his, or our, or another's attitude toward nature, or divinity, or theories of natural law, but the personality of the historic Christ. Given such a person, and unusual mental powers are assured. Given such a ministry, and unusual events will follow. To reverse the order, and go backward from effect to cause, arguing from the Gospel narrative the deity

of Jesus because he exercised divine functions in interference with the natural order, is not a safe course to follow. The divinity Jesus himself would not serve by his exceptional powers we surely are not called upon to establish by them. The harmony he always maintained with his Father we have no right to break, in our attempt to set him on his Father's throne.

Every child demands a marvel. He swims in a mysterious sea of life upon whose shores he is bound to build castles and see giants and fairies at their tasks. It is well if the child grows to maturity without drawing off this sea and leaving life one arid, desert plain. If reason is to delve and ditch and drain life of all sense of infinity, it will leave us poor indeed. If reason, in the limited sense of the term, undertakes to pass every idea of the soul through its alembic, humanity cannot escape from a life of mechanics, in a house of logical artifice. We need the atmosphere of the mysterious, like the moisture in the air, to soften lines and lend beauty to the landscape. We need the fine humility that climbs hand in hand with reason to the heights, whence larger horizons ever stretch and where the life that now is takes its place as a very small section of the life that has been and is yet to be. We cannot get on a single day without the sense of

the Infinite about us, the symbols of which alone are made plain to our best thought, while the reality ever reaches on beyond our ken. While we are bound to search out a cause in every effect, and to explain whatever we find, if we can, there lies a vast realm, even life itself, the First Cause, and all the origin, course, and destiny of life, beyond our finite reach, eternal and secure. We can no more dispense with the miraculous to-day than past ages could, nor so long as children remain childlike can we venture to remove these wonder-stories from the Bible. They are not to us of the twentieth century just what they were to those of the first Christian decades, of course, nor even what they were to the medieval world. But they serve a purpose still, and always will, for him who has any imagination and eyes to see things invisible. Is it not true that the childlike heart, retained in maturity, still finds satisfaction in the atmosphere of mystery that envelops even the things our hands have handled and our microscopes explored, until a larger faith than that of childhood supersedes the crude unbelief that once broke it down? This is the history of many minds as they pass from faith, unquestioning and open to all impressions, to doubt and uncertainty, then on to unbelief; until a larger experience and a clearer vision bring them

back again, not indeed to the childish faith, but to a stronger, broader, richer, and more vital trust in an immanent and beneficent Creator, working his will constantly on every hand. Such a faith makes room for miracles, properly defined; it even requires them, as the mind explores the vast uncharted region where God touches humanity. Thus every act of God not understood is classed, until men learn the law by which it is accomplished, in nature or in the human mind. But should the time ever come when all the laws of the activities of God are fully understood, even then the same sense of an eternal outreach beyond will possess the mind, and the experience of mystery will arise from the very excess of light.

CHAPTER XI

THE DEATH AND RESURRECTION OF JESUS AS HE REGARDED THEM

The earliest Gospel, that of Paul, declares a well-established doctrine of the death of Jesus, as "for our sins," and adds "according to the scriptures" (1 Cor. 15: 3). He must have found such a belief grounded in Old Testament quotation, when he became a member of the Christian society. This does not afford time for a mythopeic theory to grow. It requires an earlier origin of the belief in the death of Christ as a means of deliverance from sin, and in the resurrection as an incentive to new life and the hope of the world. That origin we find in the teaching of Jesus himself, toward the end of his life, given in suggestion and warning, in emotional appeal and sober statement of fact, but never in formulated doctrine or systematic creed. He left those to the men who came after him, and minds are still wondering over the material furnished in his word and deed. Wendt[1] believes

[1] Wendt, The Teaching of Jesus, II, 239 ff.

that Paul "remodeled" the thought of Jesus as to death so as to make it efficacious for the forgiveness of sins, which Jesus did not teach. The text of the Gospels suggests another point of view, and affords ground for the belief that Jesus grew through experience into a fuller and clearer appreciation of the nearness and the meaning of his death.

From the first his gentle, cheerful, confident nature, full of the sunshine of life, respondent to the beauty of the world and the needs of man, met with indifference, misunderstanding, and opposition. It could not be otherwise than that these experiences should make him wonder what the end would be. He made no progress in winning the nation; on the contrary, antagonism grew. His first successes were followed by discouraging loss of influence, even with the people, but especially with their leaders. He and his disciples were "as sheep in the midst of wolves" (Matt. 10: 16). Only a blind optimism could fail to see whither these influences would inevitably lead. He knew the history of the prophets, he beheld the persecution of John, and he perceived the spirit of the men about him. What could keep him from speculation upon violence and death as his own speedy fate? "This was a condition it needed no inspiration to draw;

all it needed was an intelligence able to measure moral forces opposed, to calculate the moment when those who were determined not to suffer public defeat would make material force the final arbiter of the dispute."[1] How was he to reconcile this fate before him with the growing conviction in his soul that he was the Messiah of his people?

The Gospels contain a series of teachings than which none are more characteristic of Jesus or more undoubtedly genuine, in which he exalts the idea of self-sacrifice, and commends it as the law of his life and of all high living. "He that findeth his life shall lose it" (Matt. 10: 39) did not mean some light experience, but the courageous facing of death itself. He doubtless recognized it as his not distant end, before he had walked long with his disciples. A certain feeling of pressure led him to hasten his visits to the cities and towns of Galilee (Mark 1: 37, 38), as if he realized that the time was short. When the disciples of John and of the Pharisees made common cause and came to him asking why he did not require his followers to fast, his answer implied that days were coming when for sorrow they would fast (Mark 2: 19, 20). This foreboding began very early in his ministry, and grew

[1] Fairbairn, The Expositor, 1896, p. 284.

apace with the misunderstanding and opposition which he faced. He knew that love is always bought with pain and sold at last in death. It was one of the elemental facts in his thinking and his life. Suffering never seems a stranger to his consciousness. Did he not recognize that by it depth and greatness come to men? Because he was the Son of God, resignation of the glories of the world and a share in life's bitterness became his portion. The reconciliation of this new conception with the popular ideal, held by his disciples, was his greatest intellectual task, while he wore his life away in friction with resisting humanity. Only his unconquerable optimism, based in the love of God, kept him true and full of hope, as he became more and more convinced that before him stood the cross, and that victory must come through suffering.

Jesus did not often speak definitely of his own death, and never until after the experience at Cæsarea Philippi, when he began to prepare his followers for seeming defeat. Probably the dim outline of disaster did not shape itself definitely enough in his fancy for him to say much about it earlier. The arrival of this crisis, when at length the disciples recognized his office and the exaltation of his person, reacted upon his own thinking, and gave him a perspective he had not known

before. They confess that he is the Messiah, the Son of the living God. Understanding that fact, they must know that he is still "Son of man," and bound to die. More than that, his death becomes a function of the Messianic office, and is pregnant with new meanings. "From that time forth began Jesus to shew unto his disciples, that he must go unto Jerusalem, and suffer many things of the elders and chief priests and scribes, and be killed, and be raised again the third day" (Matt. 16: 21). This was an absolutely new and contradictory idea to the Jews, but so was his whole scheme of an inner kingdom. The two ideas, a suffering Messiah and a spiritual kingdom, were dependent each upon the other. His earlier exhortation became a test of discipleship: "If any man will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me" (Matt. 16: 24).

A test it proved among the Twelve. They were not prepared for such radical application of the oft-repeated epigram about saving life by losing it. The glory of their ripened conviction about the Messiah was upon them. They could not easily give up the thought of power and privilege through intimacy with the coming King. They all felt in their hearts the echo of Peter's words of rebuke to the despondent element in

their Master; and Mark's picture of their estrangement from him (Mark 10: 32) represents the failure of their adjustment of inherited judgments to the new spirit and teaching of Jesus. His greatest lesson was unfolded in his death. It opened the eyes of the half-blind disciples. It was a key to much that they had failed to understand. It became the mysterious center from which radiated influences that quickened multitudes with its truth that life reaches its full estate only when it is sacrificed, and that in his constant self-giving Jesus had fulfilled all that was true in the ancient sacrificial system of his people. Many a Jew perceived that Jesus had realized the dreams of apocalyptic vision, and out of every nation have come those who find his higher law of sacrifice, in giving themselves, the satisfaction of the need that built the altars of the world.

The Gospel of Mark reports further sayings of Jesus as to his death as follows (9: 9, 10): he charged the three descending the Mount of Transfiguration with him not to report their vision until he was risen from the dead. "And they kept that saying with themselves, questioning one with another what the rising from the dead should mean." He combined with a reference to John's death a hint of his own suf-

ferings (9: 12). Again (9: 31, 32), "they understood not that saying, and were afraid to ask him." He explicitly set forth before the amazed and fearful disciples (10: 32–34) the sad facts he faced, as they journeyed toward Jerusalem. In spite of his lessons, he had to challenge the presumption of James and John (10: 35–40) by assuring them that they would share his woes, but that he could not give them seats of power. And he formulated again in striking phrase the old truth (10: 45), "For even the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many." The word ransom (λύτρον) indicates a price paid for deliverance from bondage, and here for the first time Jesus speaks of his death as a voluntary self-sacrifice, which if the words are his own, and not a Pauline touch, makes a decided advance in his teaching.

In Mark 12 we find the parable of The Wicked Husbandmen. The remark is added that the Pharisees "knew that he had spoken the parable against them." The "little apocalypse" in chapter 13, as if in response to the question of the disciples, "When shall these things be?" only infers the death of Jesus. Here first appears a word about his coming again as the Son of man "in the clouds with great power and glory," and

he adds with greatest emphasis: "This generation shall not pass, till all these things be done," as if confining his prophecy to the immediate future. Since Jesus nowhere uses the language of apocalyptic or of politics without giving it the most spiritual and figurative meaning, he must be interpreted here as speaking of disaster and deliverance soon to come. He had in mind experiences of a definitely personal and religious sort. He reveals the same method in the parable (13: 34) of the man taking a far journey and bidding his servants watch for his return, — a touch that suggests the common attitude of faith at the time when the Gospel was written, and which may be shaded by local color.

The next reference to his death reported in Mark is at the feast in the house of Simon the leper, when Jesus said of the poured-out nard, "She is come aforehand to anoint my body to the burying," — a striking insistence upon the imminence of the end. The Passover supper follows with the reported words, "This is my body," "This is my blood," following the sorrowful saying, "The Son of man indeed goeth, as it is written of him," — which is the first reference to prophecy in connection with his death in the mouth of Jesus. From this time on, every word he utters has its relation to the impending doom.

"I will drink no more of the fruit of the vine, until that day that I drink it new in the kingdom of God" (14: 25). "All ye shall be offended because of me this night: for it is written, I will smite the shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered. But after that I am risen, I will go before you into Galilee" (14: 27, 28). The prayer of Gethsemane reveals the attitude of human dread rising to divine assurance (14: 36). At the trial, when asked by the high priest, "Art thou the Christ?" he replies, "I am: and ye shall see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven" (14: 61, 62).

These are all the words about his death put by Mark upon the lips of Jesus. They begin with the confession at Cæsarea Philippi, in a general warning which the disciples utterly refuse to hear, and continue to grow more definite and detailed with every chapter until the day of doom, when for the first time he gives his friends notice of what to expect, and when.

In Matthew no definite allusion is made to the death of Jesus until (12: 40) the passage about Jonah which is interpreted of the Son of man remaining three days and three nights in the grave. But this explanation is not given in the parallel passage in Luke (11: 30) nor in the repetition of the comparison in Matthew (16: 4).

Moreover, it appears to be interpolated here between verse 39 and verse 41, as an interruption of the allusion to Jonah and Nineveh. It is probably a gloss which crept into the text from the margin, and does not belong to the words of Jesus.

The first reference to his death in Matthew (16: 21) immediately follows the confession at Cæsarea Philippi. Peter's rebuke of the Master so connects itself with his confession that the new emphasis of Jesus at this time was fixed in the tradition. He formulated the principle from this hour which his experience had already worked out: "Whosoever will save his life shall lose it" (verse 25). The next allusion follows (17: 9) when Jesus charged his disciples to tell no man of the transfiguration vision "until the Son of man be risen again from the dead," and in verse 12 he declares that the Son of man shall suffer as Elijah (that is, John) did. Again, while they still abode in Galilee, Jesus warned them of the last things (17: 22, 23). In each instance, although resurrection is the climax of his prophecy, the disciples were most concerned with the fact of his passion, "and they were exceeding sorry" (17: 23). The same palliation of their woe was offered them on the way up to Jerusalem when he took the Twelve apart (Matt. 20: 17–19) and

told them to what they went. The demand for places in his kingdom (20: 20–28) drew from him the law of service, — "even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many." The parable of The Householder (Matt. 21: 33 ff.) was his first declaration of his expected sufferings to the crowd, in the elusiveness of fancy, through which many would fail to see a picture of himself. The wail of sorrow over Jerusalem followed (23: 37 ff.) the denunciation of the Pharisees, and may be considered as a reference to the imminence of his own sufferings. "Ye shall not see me henceforth, till ye shall say, Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord." The increasing frequency of such allusions led the disciples to inquire when these things should be, and what signs they should have of his presence (24: 3, margin A. R. V.) in the consummation. Then follows the apocalyptic passage (24: 4–51) leading up to the three parables of the virgins, the talents, and the nations, all of them apocalyptic in their setting. After this he referred definitely to the approaching feast as the time of his suffering, and accepted the woman's alabaster cruse as a preparation for his burial (26: 12). He opened the doors of his friend's house in the city with the words "My time is at hand," and set the

simple meal before them as a memorial of his body and a covenant of his blood. The other details follow as in Mark.

Matthew represents Jesus as recognizing the inevitable fate of goodness, and a universal law of self-sacrifice, in his sufferings and death. He also adds to that the vicarious element of goodness ransoming others. No theory is suggested as to how his death was to work the weal of the kingdom, but he seeks the practical preparation of the disciples for the shock, and these fundamental truths are emphasized without comment. It is doubtful if Jesus ever went further than this in speech about his death, but it is certain that he anticipated it with courage, and assurance of a resurrection to eternal life and more effective action.

In Luke also there is no reference to the death of Jesus until (9: 22) after the confession at Cæsarea Philippi. The second reference is connected with the Transfiguration (9: 31) where the topic of conversation between Jesus, Moses, and Elijah is given as his decease. Then (9: 44) he taught the disciples what to expect at Jerusalem. In reply to the Pharisees who had warned him that Herod would fain kill him, he said (13: 31 ff.) "Go and say to that fox, Behold, I cast out demons and perform cures to-day and to-morrow,

and the third day I end my course. Nevertheless I must go on my way to-day and to-morrow and the day following: for it cannot be that a prophet perish out of Jerusalem." A lament over the city follows. In an apocalyptic passage (17: 22 ff.) he predicts his sufferings (verse 25) and minutely instructs the Twelve alone what they may expect in Jerusalem (18: 31–33). On the journey toward the city on Palm Sunday he weeps over it (19: 41–44) and predicts its ruin. The parable of The Wicked Husbandmen (20: 9 ff.) is spoken in the city, and a longer apocalyptic passage (21: 5–36). At the Passover supper he expressed his longing to eat that feast with them before he suffered. The other references are like those of the other Gospels. In Luke nowhere appears a word of interpretation or of explanation of his death, nor is direct allusion to his resurrection made, save in two of these passages. The failure of his disciples to comprehend his meaning is emphasized, and the calamities to come upon the city are elaborated. But nothing further than the fact of his warning given the disciples can be found in Luke.

Jesus expressed himself remotely as to the last things in numerous parables like those of the sower, the wheat and the tares, the mustard seed, the grain growing day and night, the selfish

neighbor and the unjust judge, the sleepy virgins, the talents and the pounds, the rich man and Lazarus, the vine-dresser and the husbandmen; also in such words as those of the petition "Thy kingdom come" and "The kingdom of God is within you" (Luke 11:2; 17:21). But in none of these does he hint at any doctrine in his mind connecting his own sufferings with the redemption of mankind. Three facts he held increasingly before him: death, resurrection, and judgment. This last function he assigned to the future (Matt. 7:21 ff.; 13:41 ff.; 16: 27; 25: 31; Mark 8: 38), and it is everywhere somewhat remote. The place of judge he refused to occupy (Luke 12: 14; John 8: 15), and assigned the task to the Twelve in the Kingdom to come (Matt. 19: 28; Luke 22: 30), while he did not hesitate to put himself before them as the test by which all men shall be tried (Matt. 10: 33, 40; 11: 28; 19: 14; 25: 40).

During his last days on earth, as he saw the fateful end approaching, Jesus evidently gained a new and deeper conception of his mission. With that enlargement of his self-consciousness his death meant more to him and became a correlated factor in his work. He looked upon those who were its instruments with a feeling of infinite sorrow and pity, and pronounced his woes upon them. He believed that his death was ordered

in the economy of God as a factor in the deliverance of man from sin and the establishment of his Kingdom on the earth. His gospel was to be preached throughout the world (Mark 13: 31; 14: 3–9). At the Last Supper, the words used of his body and blood in each of the Synoptists indicate a dynamic influence to be exerted upon the disciples, whether in Mark's use of ὑπὲρ πολλῶν or Luke's ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν or Matthew's more extended περὶ πολλῶν εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν. His death is for them, for the many, and more specifically, for "the remission of sins."

Just what he means by these words we can see more clearly by referring to the tradition of St. Paul, who uses ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη. The last word appears also in Mark. There is a covenant significance in the blood poured out. As the ancient rite of covenant required the use of blood from a sacrifice, to be sprinkled upon the parties involved, so blood sealed this covenant also between God and man.

The principle of sacrificial symbolism has been of world-wide extent, because so well suited to primitive thought. The totem of the tribe was the most sacred object for an offering to the gods. Individuality is not emphasized among savages, nor was it recognized in the Old Testament as it is to-day. Jahveh was a national divinity to

the early Hebrews, with whom the entire tribe must maintain covenant relations. To be ceremonially clean and attached through the nation to Jahveh was enough. Prophets and psalmists introduced a closer personal relation, and the New Testament confirmed it. This idea became the medium through which St. Paul tried to make the meaning of the death of Jesus plain.

Hunting and pastoral people considered the life and the blood to be identical. This belief gave meaning to the practise of transfusion to bind a covenant. The Semitic prohibition of eating blood (Lev. 3: 17; 7: 26, etc.) maintained the ancient regard for it as a symbol of life, and focused Jewish thought upon the blood of Jesus. It was natural that he should speak of it himself as a sign of the covenant he was giving his life to establish between God and man. And the substitution of the symbol of the wine for the actual blood was not a weakening, it was rather a strengthening, of the spiritual quality for which the blood was only a sign.

Thus Jesus seized upon primitive ethnic ideas, the simple expression of human need, and gave them their full meaning. It was a contrast to the old covenant between God and Israel, and at the same time a realization of it. The completion of the entire Mosaic system by which the Jew

had sought union with God, and the removal of it before its fuller spiritual prototype, was involved in his death as Jesus understood it. As a Jew speaking to Jews, Jesus could not fail to emphasize this transition from the national to the universal, from form to spirit, from the covenant lost in ceremonial to a covenant real in life.[1] For this sacrifice he conceived himself to be the lamb, that through him his disciples and all men might enter into loving covenant with God. He was not laying down his life as a substitute for theirs, nor as an offering to appease the wrath of God. He distinctly sought to free men from a fear of death as retribution, through his death. He was the paschal lamb, the means of a family covenant with God who safely guards the home and guides the life of every family. Jesus never feared death, but with noble dignity faced it as his own highest act. He referred to it only when exalted with love and pity for mankind, and for his disciples in particular. But the agents of his destruction were wicked husbandmen, hypocrites who are untrue to their prophets, traitors; and he mourned over the Holy City left in such hands.

[1] "His thoughts about his death attached themselves to the picture of the servant of Jahveh, whose function was prophetic rather than priestly." — STEVENS, *The Christian Doctrine of Salvation*, p. 53.

There is evidence of a terrific strain upon him in Gethsemane, but no craven fear. At first he looked upon death as an awful necessity to which he must submit; but afterward he sought for the soul of goodness in it. The picture of his calm courage, "his face set as a flint," is magnificent. The unruffled dignity and moral integrity with which he was clothed at his trial reveal the majesty of his spirit.

The story of the last experiences of Jesus offers the most moving scene in all history. The power of simple pity it arouses has never been estimated fully as a compelling force in religion. St. Francis is not the only person whose body has showed the stigmata after long dwelling on the sufferings of Christ. The Roman Catholic Church has utilized the crucifix with acute perception of its power to move the human soul. Accompanied by gratitude, pity has an immense psychic value in religion, and the passion of Jesus is its most sacred, its most prolific field. Yet none can satisfy the facts by arguing that the tragedy was arranged for any such effect, or that pity exhausts the high emotions which the death of Jesus is calculated to arouse in us.

Jesus never could have held, with the rabbis, that through excess of suffering of a righteous man a store of merit is available to cover up the

sins of others. No substitutionary ideas are compatible with his emphasis upon individuality and the personal justice as well as fatherly love of God.

Death was a bitter fate for Jesus, which he accepted as inevitable, which he reconciled with the love and care of God through his perfect assurance that he could not be held in the grave. That consciousness had become as fixed a part of his attitude toward life as his trust in the Fatherhood of God. It was a part of that faith in which he daily walked. His Jewish compeers believed in a hazy immortality in part, and some of them were even predicting that the just would rise to participate in the apocalyptic kingdom. Jesus affirmed with all confidence his faith in a future life, both for himself and for those whom he promised to shepherd upon earth in the spirit and to meet in heaven.

On the second day after the body of Jesus was laid away in the grave, out of the heavy clouds that had settled down upon the disciples and shut all light out and kept them disappointed, dumb, and desperate, suddenly shone a beam of heavenly light. Jesus was alive! Some of their number had seen him. They were electrified by the report. What had happened? No eye-witness of the act of rising from the dead was ever known;

and if there had been one, his report would be of no more value to this age than the word of the disciples who declared they saw and spoke with Jesus. Something manifestly came into the blackness of their premature night to turn it into a new and brighter day. They knew that the Master lived. The very rearrangement of the days of the week is evidence of the firm conviction which made the first day even more sacred than the seventh day, enshrined as that day had been through centuries in the most exalted reverence. No explanation of recuperation, no hint of aromatic spices and embalmer's arts, will avail. To say that Jesus was resuscitated from a swoon for a season and restored to his disciples, plunges us into difficulties greater far than those suggested by the simple narrative of the Gospels. The one thing of which we are positive is this, — that Jesus died and rose again according to the faith of the disciples, who were so convinced of his return to them that they knew it to be true, and joined it to his final ascension as a historic fact as real as any they had ever experienced.

Was the resurrection a matter of desperately aroused psychoses in the disciples, seizing upon the frequently reiterated teaching of Jesus that he could not die but must rise and carry on his work? Was it an inevitable reaction from the

abyss of their disappointment? Did sudden joy simply have to follow intense grief? If so, then the floods of their expectancy, dammed up for a day, broke loose with a mighty momentum, to carry them across the depths of death. Perhaps, as H. J. Holtzmann, V. Fritzsche and E. von Dobschuetz assert, the empty tomb gave certainty to the story of the women who discovered it, but could give only one explanation for the absence of the body of their dear dead. No thought of the removal of the body by the owner of the tomb could once dispute with the conviction that Jesus had arisen from the dead.

Are the facts beneath the Gospel story psychic rather than material? Even so, they never could have been preserved in any other form than that in which the evangelists have given them to us, — as objective, material events. That disciple group could not possibly discriminate between subjective experiences and objective facts when they came to tell of them. The narrative handed on from mouth to mouth and age to age would grow, as such a story must, and losing nothing of the essential fact would gain that drapery which at the same time preserves the fact and conceals its nakedness. The birth of a new faith in the souls of the disciples would absorb their entire being. The correlation of it with

the recent teaching of Jesus and with the inheritance of apocalypse and prophets would confirm and establish it. Here was the synthesis of truths they had tried in vain to join together, of the present and the future, of the real and the ideal, of the transcendent and the immanent, of the Kingdom on earth and that in heaven. A great reaction seized them, and from despair they turned to jubilation. They shared in the lofty inspiration of the prophets. All sorrow and suffering were glorified as a dark vestibule leading into the palace of joy and peace. Death became a friend and helper, necessary for the consummation of their lives, and of the Kingdom which was dearer than life.

This is the note of triumph sounded everywhere by St. Paul, as by the evangelists in the closing chapters of the Gospels. The last great enemy of man, more feared than all the rest, the grim destroyer of hope and joy, was defeated. The world turned its course that day toward higher things, and through the resurrection of Jesus, mediated through the faith of his disciples, faced a higher end and laid hold upon its highest joys. Is it anything to be wondered at that the disciples reveled in an abandonment of Pentecostal exuberance? Whether pathological or not, the experiences of those days are easily

accounted for, and turned as they were to the winning of men to the faith so lately given its death-blow, they bear witness to the reality of the resurrection of the Lord.

The passion for a personal conscious ego surviving death became far more vigorous at the birth of Christianity, and has not lessened with the centuries. In its true value it is not a mean self-interest of souls seeking to "get saved," but the great affirmation of the spirit that it must and shall go on. It is the psychological consciousness at its height, demanding the perfection of an incomplete evolutionary process. The highest reach of our humanity is in the direction of the Infinite.

The idea of immortality has been of immense gain to the race. It has righted the overturned sense of justice and provided for a natural relationship between pleasure and goodness, pain and wickedness. It has given a larger universe to enlarging souls and it has afforded ground for a theodicy unanswerable because of its extended field of life.

The state termed death lies beyond the reach of life, and precludes a renewal of the vital process in the precise environment and organism, according to modern science. But the word death is still popularly used in a loose way, as it was in

ancient times, for the apparent cessation of the vital functions. How large the territory covered by it is, none knows. It is a relative word, as employed in the Bible, and the New Testament writers never doubted the possibility of a physical resurrection. They did not make modern discriminations between voluntary suspended animation, like that of Indian fakirs, or the hypnotic states or coma induced by certain diseases, and the absolute organic change called death. There was nothing impossible to them in the idea of a soul returning to the body it had left and resuming life. This will account for the physical demonstrations which the writers and early readers of the New Testament required to establish their faith in the resurrection of Jesus.

We must account for Christian history. It pivots on the resurrection. St. Paul was warranted in his assertion, "If Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain." Christianity is the religion of eternal life. Immortality is its crown and completion, without which it fails to command assent. In one of three ways must the apostolic conviction as to the resurrection be accounted for. It was a fact ocularly demonstrated, according to laws of life and matter of which we are wholly ignorant; or it was a fact belonging to the psychic

realm, a "veridical hallucination" dependent upon some extra-organic, supernormal stimuli; or it was a subjective hallucination, dependent upon some intra-organic or normal extra-organic stimulus. Was the constantly reiterated suggestion of Jesus that he could not and would not remain in the grave, coupled with the overwhelming shock of his awful death, the stimulus to turn the scales and swing the minds of the disciples up out of their despair into the transports of joy which seized them like an obsession, and fixed forever in their faith the fact of the resurrection of their beloved Master and his presence with them everywhere, not only in Jerusalem but in their old haunts in Galilee and throughout the world?

In whichever direction the temper and training of individual minds may lead them, the Gospel narrative cannot be taken literally as it stands, for it raises too many questions and fails to satisfy our modern thinking. Under even the first theory, the text is inadequate, because it insists upon the raising of the physical body that lay in the tomb, but treats it now as flesh and blood to be handled and to take food, and now as an ethereal or "astral" body that passes through locked doors and must not be touched, and rises into the air to be lost in the heavens.

It is no disparagement to the Scriptures to admit this, for was it not inevitable, whatever happened, that the story should take the only possible veridical form for its preservation? Precisely the service which the architectural device called "entasis" rendered to the sensitive eye of the Greek when the builders of the Parthenon enlarged the middle diameter of each column and lengthened frieze in order that these bodies might not appear to be concave and so lose the perfection of straight lines, the treatment of these Scripture events has done for the temple of our faith, by enlargement here and there, correcting vision and making all parts appear right — lined and perfect in their symmetry.

It may be maintained, as it is believed by not a few, that through operation of laws as yet unknown to us, in that spiritual body which St. Paul declares to be as real as is the earthly body, Jesus did appear to his disciples, and, through the only channel by which conviction could be assured for them, did establish their faith in him as the eternal Master of their lives and head of the Kingdom he taught them to declare to all the world. Even then, body is not the essential element by any means, for the spirit is the true and only basis of the Lordship of Christ. But our humanity demands, even for spiritual con-

ceptions, a form for them to occupy. Incarnation saves theism from dead abstractions, and it has preserved the belief in the immortality of the soul. Who dares to deny to the body other forms and modes of being, in this day of electric theories of matter, and a basic ether in which the scientific imagination revels with an abandon that brings back the age of faith, and points to doors sure to open to reveal secrets where the realms of science and religion join. Multitudes require some sort of an organism as an essential to their thought of personal identity. Until we know what matter is, their necessity must be respected.

But I would claim for others an equal right to hold either of the other views suggested, and expect them to profess a faith as strong in the resurrection of our Lord, based upon these purely psychological experiences, unknown as such to the men and women of Galilee, but explained to the satisfaction of an increasing number in our day by the application of psychological principles now known and classified. "A Christian," says Wernle,[1] "has no difficulty in accepting as the ground of his belief in the resurrection the real projection of Jesus into this world of sense by means of a vision."

Nothing can dislodge Jesus Christ from his

[1] Beginnings of Christianity, Vol. I, p. 115.

throne as the prince of immortal life, which was brought to light through his gospel. He gathered the scattered hopes and aspirations of the world and fixed them in a new and enduring faith by which the race has been lifted up and spurred to its noblest endeavor. Jesus saw his death as a sacrifice of goodness suffering for the sake of all the good there is in men, and to it he invariably joined a resurrection, by which goodness took hold on life eternal. Thus the life of self-giving was both vindicated and made perfect in God.

CHAPTER XII

THE PSYCHOLOGICAL APPROACH TO JESUS

Unless our study has brought us to a new and richer appreciation of Jesus Christ, it has failed in its purpose and its possibilities. To gather up the results, it is necessary to review and state more fully certain points, expanding principles and drawing inferences. Can we have a Psychology of Jesus? An answer is possible in the light of the preceding chapters. We are able to reconstruct the self-consciousness of Jesus in its main outlines. That will lead us to inquire as to the secret of Jesus, and to entertain a vision of The Universal Christ.

I. Can We Have a Psychology of Jesus?

Serious charges of inadequacy are brought against the Gospels, and sober facts regarding their disagreements, their faults due to a generation of oral tradition, the utter want of an "apparatus criticus" among the evangelists, and the inevitable influence of the subjective element upon men who wrote with their hearts' blood.

Yet in spite of all, how can we escape from the conviction that we have in the Gospels the outlines of a character which we can fill in with probability, if not with absolute certainty? The farther we enter into the spirit of the apostolic age and the clearer we apprehend the factors determining the thought forms of that generation, the greater will be our conviction that we can know the Christ behind tradition and construct anew for ourselves his inner life. Wrede has made a most clever book,[1] but he carries his theory of the mystery of the Messiah too far, and we are convinced with Bousset[2] that he goes too far. He has attributed to a single motive events and experiences which do not belong together. There was a Messianic secret, but that does not make it impossible that Jesus may have had a purpose in employing it as a factor in his training of the disciples.

If, as John Fiske suggests, the object of civilization is to keep mankind young by conserving and lengthening the period of adolescence, then Jesus fits the ideal requirement of the process, for he took a generation to prepare for the brief career in which he moved the world. For that period we can describe no logical development,

[1] Das Messiasgeheimniss.

[2] Theologische Rundschau, Jan., 1902, pp. 347–362.

but his genetic progress can be traced, and that is what we need in order to understand his mission to men. One cannot so easily escape the impression of simple reality made by the narrative of the four or five critical events in the history of Jesus, — the baptism, the temptation, the confession at Cæsarea Philippi, the transfiguration, and the action and passion of the last week. Tradition was hung upon these as a spider's web upon its moorings. No matter how much may have been filled in between, these are rendered absolutely necessary by Christian history from the first. No tradition can cohere or survive without some scheme of facts that belong to the sources. These cannot be invented, however much the fancy may spin about them and between. And by these fixed points the circle of the life of Jesus must be drawn. Wrede declares that mere psychologizing over the person of Jesus is unwarranted and vain. But there is a scientific use of the imagination in psychology for reconstructing a man's soul and formulating his inner life from even a few fixed facts, precisely as there is a scientific use of the imagination in zoology for reconstructing the form and life-history of a mastodon from a few decayed bones.

Our day and race do not judge historical accuracy in the same way that the first Christian

century and the writers of Scripture in Palestine estimated it. We demand objectivity where they were often satisfied with subjective experiences. Our prosaic, matter-of-fact minds do not easily appreciate the poetic atmosphere through which the Semite saw things and in which he wrote. We forget that "The poet's ideal is the truest truth."[1] Men of small literary culture, enthusiastic in advocating a new faith, could hardly be expected to escape the subjective bias and the fanciful trend of the times. In reading the Gospels we must make allowance for these things, while avoiding the extreme position of men like Wrede who, in seeking to sail clear of the Scylla of a too psychological appreciation of Jesus, has struck on the Charybdis of making his criticism a psychology of the evangelists. We are safe in holding at least a hypothetical certainty as to the truth of the picture of Jesus drawn so consistently in the first three Gospels, while a reverent criticism carries on its priceless labors of testing and approval. Matthew affords us glimpses of a great Jewish deliverer. Mark paints for us a true reformer of heroic mold. Luke introduces us to a gentle, gracious servant of good-will, ministering to the needs of the people in a broad humanity. Each phase of

[1] Hawthorne, The Great Stone Face

his life and character belongs to the historic influence which gave birth to Christianity. There was a certain universalism in the Master that gave him a wide and stable basis for appeal to men.

At the same time let us not fail to recognize the use of inevitable vehicles for carrying the truth to us across the ages. "The best myth is a deeper and broader expression of human nature and needs than reason or history has yet attained, and is thus the shape revelation might be expected to take."[1]

II. The Self-consciousness of Jesus

Justice has not been done to the mentality of Jesus, and the perfect sanity in which he touched the world. He developed roundly, fully, and was set symmetrically in life. His practical wisdom appears in the way in which he met men. He reached their minds, their hearts, and turned the current of their lives with a steady hand and a firm purpose. His mental activity was very great, with the consistency of power guided to a simple goal, and that goal uniquely his own discovery. He grasped the meaning of history so inclusively as to form a masterly conception of its past and future continuity. His teaching has an inner unity that is a far truer sign of his

[1] Hall, Adolescence, II, p. 332.

endowment than any ordered system would have been.

Emotionally he was well developed, as men of power always are. The emotions become an aid to correct judgment, and bear witness to depth of soul when held well in leash. "Want of feeling," said Dr. Johnson, "is want of parts." This Great Heart lived profoundly in his affections and his sympathies for men, especially for those whom he saw astray as sheep without a shepherd. Every phase of life allured him, with his passion to increase the abundance of living. Sin and woe and want called him out, and yet he never lost his joy and peace, for he was poised in wide vision, and drank deep of the springs of hope. His optimism was deduced from his perpetual experience with God and his faith in the efficacy of love as a solvent of the woes of a weary, wicked world.

His life was thus strongly motivated, and his will, his sense of power, was irresistible. He was so single-hearted, he knew so well whither his life must lead, in the clear apprehension of his Father's love and the conviction that his opportunity with men lay in love, that he possessed an inner power which was felt by all who knew him. He seemed to his enemies self-confident and self-assertive. God-intoxicated men are

liable to give that impression. But they are also liable at last to lose themselves precisely where Jesus found himself, in God.

After the baptism Jesus assumed certain Messianic functions, although not in accordance with the popular program of the day. He set himself over against Moses as an authority superior to that venerated name. He called himself the bridegroom for whom people waited, and the Son of man, and he forgave sin. He proclaimed a greater than Jonah or Solomon or the temple as at hand in his own person. With a note of power he called down woes upon Capernaum and Bethsaida where men did not turn unto him.

He was bolder than any other teacher in history. Never egotistical, his egoism was sublime. And for all his claims he found proof in himself, but nowhere else. He made of his inner life the supreme test for all mankind. He ventured to pass judgment upon all history, and to establish himself upon the throne forever. He even set his death into the scheme of his thought, and made it, with an audacity almost incomprehensible, a factor in his success and the chief proof of his service to men, the ground of his ultimate appeal.

Either he was guilty of immense presumption,

or else he was assured that men could not get on without him, because he occupied an essential place in the evolution of the race. He spoke with an accent of authority as if he felt the power of control over all the world. He employed no incantations or muttered spells such as his contemporaries used in casting evil spirits out or in cure of other diseases. He issued commands to deaf ears, blind eyes, weakened muscles, and the natural forces obeyed him. He claimed authority of personal relationship above all other, even that of parents,[1] on the ground that upon him depended all future welfare.[2] And toward the end of his ministry he asserted the right of supreme control over the future of mankind.[3]

Over thirty times in the First Gospel he is reported as repeating, "Verily I say unto you," often placing his naked word over against the tradition of the elders. He did not fall back upon any prophetic formula, "Thus saith the Lord," but stood forth with an immediate inner consciousness of original authority. In the same spirit he bade men "Follow me," and linked the destiny of other souls to his own person.[4] He

[1] Matt. 8: 22; 10: 37.

[2] Matt. 10: 32; 16: 24 ff.; Mark 8: 34 ff.; Luke 9: 23 ff.; 12: 8 ff.

[3] Matt. 24: 30 ff.; Mark 13: 26 ff.; Luke 21: 27 ff.

[4] Matt. 10: 14, 40.

pronounced doom and pardon with equal assurance, and put himself above Abraham and Moses as an authority for the people. "He did not preach his opinions, he preached himself."[1]

Yet with all his self-assertion he was the meek and lowly Jesus, walking toward his cross. He professed to reveal no wisdom; he merely brought home to men the meaning of life. He knew his limitations. He prayed to God as other men do; he was obedient and submissive to his Father in heaven, whose will he preferred to his own. He did not know the times and seasons which the apocalyptic gloried in; and at the last he felt himself left alone even by his God. This gentle teacher, associating with fisherfolk and beggars, with the sick and outcast and forsaken, giving of his time, his help, his very soul to obscure individuals by the way, — taking little children in his arms and making use of a title for himself which would tend to conceal his office and place him close to every simple man — bears a charm of true humility that makes one expect of him the greatness which humility never forsakes. Thus he united a self-consciousness unique, sublime, with that humble spirit which mothers all the virtues in mankind.

[1] Renan.

III. The Secret of Jesus

Jesus came into Jewish and so into general history, to assume a part in it as a reconstructor of the old, in order that out of it, in perfectly natural continuity, the new might proceed. But his method was one of careful selection according to his own standards and the highest spirits of the past. "Every great man," said Carlyle,[1] "every genuine man, is by the nature of him a son of Order, not of Disorder." He comes not to destroy but to fulfil.

The fact that he did not altogether escape from the thinking of his time and people is no sign of failure in his high design. His power to detect and assimilate truth everywhere and in all things and all men is manifest in spite of the fact that he tolerated many a form of thought or speech not altogether true, and even used them; as one uses tongs to lay the coals of his fire. But one does not make the tongs the main thing; the fire is the reality with which he is dealing.

This makes Jesus of importance to every age. He has so much of truth to give that has not yet been acquired by any age or race, that he must be interpreted afresh to each generation and to every people in the terms with which they are familiar,

[1] Lectures on Heroes, p. 272.

according to the mental atmosphere they breathe. The manna of yesterday loses its freshness and its savor to-day, but the same liberal hand provides for the hungry still, and we must arise to gather for our need.

Jesus did not seek the Messianic office, nor did he crave the consciousness that possessed him. It was thrust upon his soul. A deep conviction seized him, and in regal spirit he arose to bear the burden and fulfil the superhuman task. It is impossible to appreciate his character without this element of finality and this sense of responsibility to all mankind, which he felt because he knew that he had come into closest touch with God. To attempt to account for him by the analysis of his age is to fail. Dante and Shakespeare and Goethe cannot be accounted for by the literature of the preceding ages or the experiences of their own day. Each added himself to all that had gone before or went on around him. The same is true of Jesus in a multiplied form.

Strauss believed that the appearance of the idea of humanity in history was and ever will be an absolute miracle which can never be established in the regular course of events that we explain by common experience. There is in every great soul something of this intangible and inex-

plicable quality, for each of them is the partial realization of the idea of humanity.

At the same time Jesus presented himself everywhere as the path to glory, not as the consummation. He insisted that he was a minister rather than a master, and cherished his humanity over against divinity. We can ascertain something of his psychoses but we can say nothing of his neuroses. The common factors entered into the making of his personality — heredity, environment, and the personal reaction to each. The stronger the character, the larger bulks the last factor in its making. It is the original element in man, the new creation which distinguishes him from every brother or sister who shares the same heredity and environment. It is the ineluctable ego, the "quidam divinus afflatus" which Cicero declared was found in every man. In personality lies the secret of Jesus. Apart from that his contribution to history is merely a fragmentary ethical system. That secret has not yet been told, and never will be, in such terms as men use to explain the processes of nature or the work of their own hands, for it is life itself, life at its highest, life unhindered and supreme. We are studying, not mere neurological or pathological phenomena, but profound spiritual experiences, expressed by the

psychoses of daily life, but not accounted for even by the man himself. "Any sincere soul knows not *what* he is, . . . can of all things the least measure — himself! What others take him for, and what he guesses that he may be; these two items strangely act on one another, help to determine one another. With all men reverently admiring him; with his own wild soul full of noble ardors and affections, of whirlwind, chaotic darkness and glorious new light; a divine Universe bursting all into godlike beauty round him, and no man to whom the like ever had befallen, what could he think himself to be? 'Wuotan?' All men answered, 'Wuotan!'"[1]

The leading force in energizing human institutions is always found in some heroic personality who has impressed himself upon others and imparted to them his enthusiasm of soul. So with Jesus Christ and the Church. There is no way of accounting for the organization apart from the adequate person behind, or at the head of it.

The task for the student of Christianity is, to avoid the shallow hero worship of romanticism which stakes all on an individual, and at the same time to escape the mechanical accounting for everything that happens by the blind forces of an evolving social life without a place for per-

[1] Carlyle, Heroes and Hero Worship, p. 34.

sonality. We have reached a period when something of the truth of evolutionary progress is recognized by all Bible students, with Ferdinand Christian Baur; and we are not so much afraid of myth and legend as forms of expression of truth as people were in the days of David Frederick Strauss.[1] But we need a clear-cut idea of the personality of Jesus, as the founder of our religion; and a new approach, neither dogmatic nor superstitious, to him who, as Ritschl insists, and as all Christians of every name demonstrate in their thinking, reveals to us who and what God is.

"Whenever men begin to set forth their Christ, it is an ideal either of themselves or of some one they deeply revere and love." It cannot be otherwise. "An ideal necessarily mingles with all conceptions of Christ," said Jowett; "why should we object to a Christ who is necessarily ideal? Do persons really suppose that they know Christ as they know a living friend? Is not Christ in the sacrament, Christ at the right hand of God, Christ in you the hope of glory, an ideal? Have not the disciples of Christ, from the age of Paul onwards, been always

[1] "What the legend is to history, the myth is to psychology. It becomes a deeper and truer expression of humanity than history." — Dr. G. Stanley Hall.

idealizing this memory?" "How fortunate that dogma about the actual Jesus is not possible!" He is only partially known to us; "enough to assist us, but not enough to constrain us," as Jowett goes on to say. No biography of him in the modern sense is possible, and just because of that, the various Christ-ideals have arisen — the grandest, noblest thing Christianity has done for the race — and the grandest, noblest thing about the creation of the ideal is, that it is ever expanding as the soul of man expands. If we had had a full biography of Jesus, this would not have been possible. It is just because the details of the life of Jesus are so meager that the ideal of the Christ has grown around it, — giving it in the first place a location and a name, and in the second place finding for it new organs of expression in every age, developing new powers, and assimilating new elements of human life as that life grows richer and deeper."[1]

In seeking Jesus we do not demand to know the data of his life which critics challenge, nor the very words he spoke, as if this were the essential factor in our faith. We look for the man, his ideals, experiences, motives, thoughts, and feelings, and care little for the temporary intel-

[1] "Why not Face the Facts," by Dr. K. C. Anderson, *The Hibbert Journal*, July, 1906, pp. 845–860.

lectual equipment with which he worked or the minor limitations under which he dwelt. The man's value as a man is what we need to know and appreciate anew, for in him there is a touch with God which lifts our humanity to its loftiest place and makes it possible for us to understand in human terms the very life of God. For this the soul of man hungers and thirsts. To Jesus it will never cease to turn with the heart's eager questionings and unutterable longings for the light. The Christ born in the heart is the essential Christ. If the light is forever to be sifted down to us through rich glass of great age, bearing mellow color and designs elaborate with pictures from ancient stories and quaint legends, we shall never know the reality of sunlight soft and warm and colorless in its clear illumination, nor shall we be able by it to see all our way. But if we can leave the hoary seats, and pass outside the structure which it has taken so many ages to build, and discover for ourselves the joy of day, then we shall be blessed indeed in Jesus Christ.

Have we only a dogmatic Christ? Is Christ more Paul than Jesus? The psychological approach brings us back to Jesus rather than back to Christ; to the person rather than to the official; to the teacher rather than to the theologian. It

is not a reversion to some lower, partial stage of being, but rather a reversion to type, from which must start true progress along the pathway indicated for the higher man, whence our undue magnifying of dogma and institution, of system and order, has caused us to swerve. We must repeat the process instituted by Jesus when he reached back past the scribes and drew out from the moldy chest of rolls the prophets, and set them before men with their message of a spiritual religion. But we have this advantage, — which becomes a disadvantage in the difficulty of its art and craft, — that we seek to set a personality rather than a principle, a character rather than an atmosphere, before this generation. We enjoy a sense of finality in the ideal that has survived so many centuries and is still unattained, and we turn with confidence to him who introduced it, expecting to discover in him the same potency for us that has influenced so profoundly the history of mankind.

IV. The Universal Christ

Jesus says almost nothing of himself; save that he knows the Father and is in perfect accord with him. In that he finds his fullest life, and of that his consciousness consists. This is the human at its best. The consciousness of the

God-man is the highest possible experience. A unique and sublime personality, he went to the common experience of the race, and sought the solution of life in the value of feeling, which lies beneath all life. Life is saved, not by ideas, nor in action or passion under universal law, but in the instinctive feelings, where it began. The waters of the ocean must return thither again at last for healing in its purity. Neither philosophy within nor surrender to externals will satisfy life, — its secret is within the deepest depths of our being, where is the well of love. "True piety is earthly love transcendentalized, and the saint is the lover purified, refined, and perfected. To have attained this insight, to have organized it into life, cult and a Church, is the supreme claim of Jesus upon the gratitude, reverence, and awe of the human heart. No such saving service has ever been rendered to our race, and we can see no room in the future for any other to be compared with it."[1]

The problem of Christianity is to focus the strongest instincts on the highest object; and this is a psychic, not a metaphysical adventure. Christianity is the religion that brings the soul to love the most worthy things. The Christian is the man who bases life in the genetic principle,

[1] Hall, Adolescence, Vol. II, p. 294.

and gives sonship to God the place of honor in his thought and life, with immortality as the goal. Love is the causal instinct. The universe came into being through love. An eternal evolution of love proceeds from the Father, so that Rothe can say, "Love is creation," or Schopenbauer, "Love is the wish to create." Thus the lover himself is developed and perfected with perfect liberty in the new law and joy of self-realization. Jesus anticipated modern psychology when he centered life in sentiment and under religion the richest and the highest expression of passion. If he came to this through reasoned thought upon the Abrahamic covenant which found its medium in the sex-life of the Hebrew race, he elevated that life immeasurably and proved himself "the master mind of all philosophy." If he came to it instinctively, through his own personal experience, and only by reflection connected it with the history of his race, still he fulfilled that history far beyond its promise, and took a place as leader above all the patriarchs when he established love as the dominant force in the upward struggle of mankind. He held in his hand the key to all the hidden chambers where God's most precious jewels are. Nature, art, science, all are opened by love. Love on the lower levels cannot see nor enter in; but love

elevated to its best is shut out by no gates or walls. The great poets are great lovers. Far more is due to love than was suspected. Psychology is just beginning to give this force its due, as the primary creative force and the progressive impulse to the culmination of creation in man's full self-consciousness as beloved of God, his son. For man draws nearer to divinity as he draws from within his own soul the refreshing streams of life and finds his power, his authority there.

The assured certainty of Jesus, resting not on pure thinking but deep down in the spirit, as Wernle insists,[1] gave him power as by forces from above to which he abandoned himself. In the new truth mediated through his experience and his person he lost himself, and thus he was prepared to feel the impulse of the history of his race coming to a climax in his soul, where he summed up all the best thought and feeling of his people. A phylogenetic growth in him is evident, and he focused it in his teaching of the Kingdom. That is why he made not sin, nor justification, nor righteousness, but the Kingdom the center of his teaching, — a Kingdom composed of the sons of God who are in sympathetic touch with the Father. Indeed, he went still

[1] The Beginnings of Christianity, vol. II, p. 45.

further, and set himself before men as the ideal member, the founder and leader of this Kingdom, and professed to make his personal relation to God the model for all the sons of God.

Certain modern interpreters explain the Kingdom as a new social order. It was not that to Jesus. He had no definite plan for society; he only taught social principles. He built no institutions, but furnished the motor impulse which in time must organize itself as opportunity offers. His Kingdom is subjective in its origin, born of the touch of God upon his soul, but objective in its operation, as every age requires. He was concerned with the first principles, and trusted to the future for their expression.

The power of a personality rich in love, large in idealism and possessed of consequent enthusiasm that infects all men it touches round about, cannot be estimated easily, much less explained either in its character or in its origin. There lies in it something of the divine and mysterious, too close to our human life's deepest reality to analyze and coolly calculate. Some influences which served to shape the expression of this personality, some factors even in its make-up, we can trace. But having done all, we cannot say that we have explained Jesus Christ or reduced him to the ordinary rank of heroes. We must still

acknowledge that in him is something intangible, a quality of goodness, beauty, truth, which satisfies our deepest instincts and renders still, as it has always done, a racial service of inspiration and uplift. He reassures humanity, because in him nothing mean or low has ever yet been found. He illuminates divinity, because all his conduct represents to us the divine way of doing things, and he himself declared that he interpreted God to man as truly as man to himself. The most precious treasure of a people is found in its heroes. What they are the nation will become. The most priceless possession of the race is this Universal Hero, whose spirit has proved so cosmopolitan as to insure an "Oriental Christ" and an "Occidental Christ," with a power of leadership to attract and move all peoples. This super-man, this union of the human and the divine, this meeting point of earth and sky, is the evolutionary type established as the ideal of a new order.

It has been claimed of late that Christianity is inadequate as a world-religion, for it has fatally neglected the elements of the Beautiful and the True in its overzealous pursuit of the Good. Such a criticism does not give credit to the esthetic and the philosophical elements in the religion of Christ. True, Jesus never placed

the three Greek essentials upon an equality in his own life or in the life of the world. But he left a place for the lesser qualities after he had established in the first place that which comes first in the life of mankind, and must come first if the race is to survive. Ethical character is the fundamental element in God, in the individual, in history. Esthetics follows as a pleasing but not essential characteristic. Intellectual satisfaction always follows moral decision, and otherwise it is a non-essential in the life of man. Jesus established his religion on the broadest and simplest basis, which all men share. Esthetics depends upon gifts of sense or imagination; the reason must be trained; but no man is left without a witness in himself of righteousness.

If education be conscious evolution, then it is necessary for every advance of learning that an ideal, a model toward which to strive, be set before those who are to be trained. In the broader equipment of the race, it is essential that the highest ideal be kept before mankind. Evolutionally this is the function of Jesus Christ. Human thinking requires an ideal man as a goal toward which we shall struggle upward to our destiny. Only in such a conscious striving can we make progress on our way.

Jesus Christ interpreted and spiritualized the

ideal of his race, and gave the world in doing so the ideal it had sought in every Utopian dream. He brought the natural and the spiritual into harmony, and revealed the final destiny of the age-long progress of life by biologic processes, in a spiritual existence no less biologic. The Kingdom of God will realize the final social ideals of history, and in it shall not mankind find satisfaction and a fitting goal? "That ideal figure will, and indeed must, remain unique in our experience. It is not a philosophical presupposition, but history itself, which decides whether or not there has been a highest point in the history of humanity when its ideal became reality."

Jesus did not limit his teachings by any ties of time or blood. He grasped fundamental human principles, because he cross-sectioned life where it touches God. He dealt in universals. Yet he attempted no system of thought. He simply taught with immediate reference to present needs, and the empirical nature of his service made his words generally applicable. He did not pose as a world-philosopher, but he was convinced that the cure of the sin and misery in those to whom he ministered would suffice for any man. The ancient faith of his nation that their God was the God of gods and Lord

of lords, and their salvation was for the healing of the nations, was thus gathered up and fulfilled in the sublime faith of Jesus that he himself was the path-breaker of mankind.

Shall Christianity still fulfil?[1] Has it a message and a mission for other world-faiths as it had for Judaism? As the law of Moses was sublimated to a higher reality and the promise to Abraham was ideally realized in the new gospel, so it may serve Buddha, Brahma, Confucius, and Mohammed, to carry out each enduring impulse in them, completing and unifying all in the person and teaching of the Master. Buddhism and Mohammedanism are the only other missionary religions, and so the only competitors of Christianity. The highest product of the first is old Japan, of the second is Turkey, — and history demonstrates that these are not on the way to realize an ultimate type of civilization. England, Germany, America are not yet made perfect, but he who is bold enough to deny to them the elements out of which an ideal social state shall grow has in him no hope of the race. If Christianity will shed its shell of dogmatism, deliver itself anew from the shackles of ecclesiasticism, and insist upon the spirit alone behind the letter

[1] See Hall, Adolescence, II, p. 361 ff., for a suggestive treatment of this idea.

of its law of love, then it must take its place as the supreme world-faith, the satisfaction of the normal human heart, the realization of every national ideal, the consummate discipline and comfort of humanity.

A PARTIAL BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THE FIELD

Adeney, W. F. Theology of the New Testament. N. Y., Whittaker & Co., 1894. pp. 248.

Anderson, K. C. Why not Face the Facts? Hibbert Jour., July, 1906. Vol. 4, pp. 845–860.

Bacon, B. W. Introduction to the New Testament. N. Y., Macmillan Co., 1900. pp. 285.

Bacon, B. W. The Transfiguration Story. Amer. Jour. of Theology, April, 1902. Vol. 6, pp. 236–265.

Baldensperger, W. Das Selbstbewusstsein Jesu. Strassburg, J. H. E. Heitz, 1888. pp. 192.

Barrows, C. H. The Personality of Jesus. Boston, Houghton, Mifflin Co., 1906. pp. 247.

Beyschlag, W. Das Leben Jesu. Halle, E. Stein, 1887. 2 vols.

Bigg, C. The Christian Platonists of Alexandria. N. Y., Macmillan Co., 1886. pp. 304.

Bousset, W. Die Religion des Judentum im Neutestamentlichen Zeitalter. Berlin, Reuther u. Richard, 1903. pp. 512.

Bousset, W. Jesus. Tr. by J. P. Trevelyan. London, Williams & Norgate, 1906. pp. 211.

Bousset, W. Jesu Predigt in Ihrem Gegensatz zum Judentum. Göttingen, 1892. pp. 130.

Briggs, C. A. Messianic Prophecy. N. Y., C. Scribner's Sons, 1886. pp. 519.

Briggs, C. A. New Light on the Life of Jesus. N. Y., C. Scribner's Sons, 1904. pp. 196.

Briggs, C. A. The Messiah of the Gospels. N. Y., C. Scribner's Sons, 1894. pp. 337.

Briggs, C. A. The Ethical Teaching of Jesus. N. Y., C. Scribner's Sons, 1904. pp. 293.

Bruce, A. B. The Kingdom of God. N. Y., C. Scribner's Sons, 1889. pp. 344.

Buckham, J. W. Christ and the Eternal Order. Boston, The Pilgim Press, 1906. pp. 190.

Charles, R. H. The Apocalypse of Baruch. London, A. & C. Black, 1896. pp. 74 + 176.

Charles, R. H. The Book of Enoch. N. Y., H. Frowde, 1893. pp. 391.

Charles, R. H. The Book of Jubilees. London, A. & C. Black, 1902. pp. 89 + 275.

Charles, R. H. The Assumption of Moses. London, A. & C. Black, 1897. pp. 117.

Cheyne, T. K. Jewish Religious Life of the Exile. N. Y., G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1898, pp. 270.

Cremer, H. Biblisch-theologisches Wörterbuch der Neutestamentlichen Grăcität. 6th ed. Gotha, F. A. Perthes, 1889. pp. 935.

Dale, R. W. The Atonement. London, Hodder, 1875. pp. 503.

Dalman, G. The Words of Jesus. Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 1902. pp. 350.

Delitzsch, F. System of Biblical Psychology. Tr. by R. E. Wallis. Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 1890. pp. 585.

Dill, S. D. Roman Society from Nero to M. Aurelius. N. Y., Macmillan Co., 1905. pp. 337.

Dillmann, C. F. A. Das Buch Henoch, Uebersetzt und Erklaert. Leipzig, Vogel, 1853. pp. 62 + 332.

Dorner, I. A. History of the Development of the Doctrine of the Person of Christ. Tr. by W. L. Alexander. Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 1892. 2 vols. in 5.

Drummond, J. The Jewish Messiah. London, 1877. pp. 395.

Edersheim, A. The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah. 4th ed. London, Longmans & Co., 1887. 2 vols.

Edersheim, A. Sketches of Jewish Social Life in the Days of Christ. London, Rel. Tract Society, 1876. pp. 342.

Encyclopedia Biblica. Ed. by T. K. Cheyne and J. S. Black. N. Y., Macmillan Co., 1899–1903. 4 vols.

Fairbairn, A. M. Studies in the Life of Christ. N. Y., D. Appleton & Co., 1882. pp. 359.

Fairbairn, A. M. The Place of Christ in Modern Theology. N. Y., C. Scribner's Sons, 1893. pp. 556.

Fairbairn, A. M. The Thought of Jesus Concerning His Own Death. The Expositor, Oct. 1896.

Foster, G. B. The Finality of the Christian Religion. Chicago, University Press, 1906. pp. 518.

Gould, E. P. Biblical Theology of the New Testament. N. Y., Macmillan Co., 1900. pp. 221.

Hall, G. S. Adolescence. N. Y., D. Appleton & Co., 1904. 2 vols.

Harnack, A. What is Christianity? Tr. by T. B. Saunders. 2d ed. N. Y., Putnams, 1903. pp. 322.

Hastings, J. A Dictionary of the Bible. N. Y., C. Scribner's Sons, 1904. 5 vols.

Hatch, E. Influence of Greek Ideas and Usages upon the Christian Church. London, Williams & Norgate, 1892. pp. 359. (Hibbert Lectures, 1888.)

Hausrath, A. Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte. Vol. 1, Die Zeit Jesu. 2d ed. Heidelberg, 1868. pp. 460.

Herzog, J. J. & Plitt, G. L. Real-Encyclopædie für protestantisch Theologie und Kirche. Leipzig, J. C. Hinrich, 1879. pp. 789.

Holtzmann, H. J. Die Synoptiker. Freiburg i. B., J. C. B. Mohr, 1889. pp. 432.

Holtzmann, H. J. Das leere Grab und die Gegenwärtigen Verhandlung über die Auferstehung Jesu. Theologische Rundschau von W. Bousset, Tübingen, March and April 1906. pp. 79–86, 119–132.

Josephus, F. Works and Life. Philadelphia, Grigg Elliot and Co., 1848. 2 vols. in 1.

Juelicher, A. Die Gleichnisreden Jesu. Vol. 1, 2d ed. Tübingen, J. C. B. Mohr, 1899. 2 vols.

Keim, C. T. The History of Jesus of Nazara. Tr. by A. Ransom. London, Williams & Norgate, 1876–1883. 6 vols.

Klausner, J. Die Messianischen Vorstellungen des Jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter der Tannaiten. Berlin, M. Poppelauer, 1904. pp. 119.

Laurence, R. The Book of Enoch the Prophet. Oxford, 1821.

Lobstein, P. The Virgin Birth of Christ. Tr. by V. Leuliette. N. Y., G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1903. pp. 138.

McConnell, S. D. Christ. N. Y., Macmillan Co., 1904. pp. 232.

Macfarland, C. S. Jesus and the Prophets. N. Y., G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1905. pp. 249.

Mathews, S. The Messianic Hope in the New Testament. Chicago, University Press, 1905. pp. 338.

Mathews, S. History of the New Testament Times in Palestine. N. Y., Macmillan Co., 1899.

Meyer, A. Die Auferstehung Christi. Tübingen, J. C. B. Mohr, 1905. pp. 368.

Mommsen, T. The History of Rome. Tr. by W. P. Dickson. New ed. N. Y., C. Scribner's Sons, 1900. 5 vols.

Muirhead, L. A. The Eschatology of Jesus. N. Y., A. C. Armstrong & Son, 1904. pp. 224.

Neander, J. A. W. The Life of Jesus Christ. Tr. by J. McClintock. London, Bell, 1888. pp. 499.

Nichols, H. P. The Temporary and the Permanent in New Testament Revelation. N. Y., T. Whittaker, 1905. Bohlen Lectures for 1905. pp. 248.

Pfleiderer, O. Christian Origins. Tr. by D. A. Huebsch. N. Y., B. W. Huebsch, 1906. pp. 295.

Pfleiderer, O. Early Christian Conceptions of Christ. London, Williams & Norgate, 1905. pp. 170.

Polano, H. The Talmud; Selections, etc. London, Warne, n. d. pp. 359.

Porter, F. C. Messages of the Apocalyptical Writers. N. Y., C. Scribner's Sons, 1905. pp. 367.

Renan, J. E. The Life of Jesus. Tr. by Wilbour. N. Y., G. W. Carleton & Co., 1864. pp. 376.

Rhees, R. The Life of Jesus of Nazareth. N. Y., C. Scribner's Sons, 1900. pp. 320.

Riggs, J. S. A History of the Jewish People During the Maccabean and Roman Periods. N. Y., C. Scribner's Sons, 1900. pp. 317.

Ryle, H. E., and James, M. R., *eds.* Psalms of the Pharisees; called the Psalms of Solomon. N. Y., Macmillan Co., 1891. pp. 94 + 175.

Sanday, W. The Criticism of the Fourth Gospel. N. Y., C. Scribner's Sons, 1905. pp. 268.

Schmidt, N. The Prophet of Nazareth. N. Y., Macmillan Co., 1905. pp. 422.

Schmiedel. Jesus' Self-consciousness.

Schultz, H. Alttestamentliche Theologie. Göttingen, Vanderhoeck u. Ruprecht, 1889. pp. 823.

Schürer, E. History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ. N. Y., C. Scribner's Son, 1885–86. 5 vols.

Schürer, E. Das Messianische Selbstbewusstsein Jesu Christi. Göttingen, Vanderhoeck u. Ruprecht, 1903. pp. 24.

Smith, G. A. The Historical Geography of the Holy Land. 7th ed. N. Y., A. C. Armstrong & Son, 1900. pp. 711.

Soden, H., Baron von. The History of Early Christian Literature. Tr. by J. R. Wilkinson. N. Y., G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1906. pp. 476.

Soltau, W. The Birth of Jesus Christ. Tr. by M. A. Canney. London, A. & C. Black, 1903. pp. 83.

Spaeth, H. Die Entwickelung Jesu. Leipzig, Barth, 1872. (Vorträge protestantische. Vol. 3, no. 6.)

Stalker, J. The Christology of Christ. N. Y., A. C. Armstrong & Son, 1889. pp. 298.

Stanton, V. H. The Jewish and the Christian Messiah. Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 1886. pp. 397.

Stapfer, E. Jesus Christ before his Ministry. Tr. by L. S. Houghton. N. Y., C. Scribner's Sons, 1896.

Stapfer, E. Jesus Christ during his Ministry. Tr. by L. S. Houghton. N. Y., C. Scribner's Sons, 1897.

Stapfer, E. Death and Resurrection of Jesus Christ. Tr. by L. S. Houghton. N. Y., C. Scribner's Sons, 1898.

Stevens, G. B. The Teaching of Jesus. N. Y., Macmillan Co., 1901. pp. 190.

Stevens, G. B. The Christian Doctrine of Salvation. N. Y., C. Scribner's Sons, 1905. pp. 541.

Stewart, A. M. The Temptation of Jesus. London, A. Melrose, 1903. pp. 230.

Strauss, D. F. The Life of Jesus. Tr. by Geo. Eliot from 4th German ed. 2d ed. N. Y., Macmillan Co., 1892. pp. 784.

Tholuck, F. A. G. The Sermon on the Mount. Tr. by R. L. Brown. Philadelphia, Smith, English & Co., 1860. pp. 443.

Toy, C. H. Judaism and Christianity. Boston, Little, Brown & Co., 1890. pp. 456.

Weber, F. Die Lehren des Talmud. Leipzig, Dörffling u. Franke, 1886. pp. 399.

Weinel, H. Die Bildersprache Jesu in ihrer Bedeutung für die Erforschung seines inneren Lebens. Giessen, J. Ricker, 1900. pp. 49. (In Festgruss Bernhard Stade, 1900.)

Weiss, B. The Life of Christ. Tr. by J. W. Hope. Edinburgh, T. &. T. Clark, 1883–84. 3 vols.

Weiss, J. Das aelteste Evangelium. Göttingen, Vanderhoeck u. Ruprecht, 1903. pp. 414.

Wellhausen, J. Prolegomena to the History of Israel. Tr. by J. S. Black and A. Menzies. Edinburgh, A. & C. Black, 1885. pp. 552.

Wellhausen, J. Die Pharisäer und die Sadducäer. Griefswald, L. Bamberg, 1874. pp. 164.

Wendt, H. H. Der Inhalt der Lehre Jesu. Göttingen, Vanderhoeck u. Ruprecht, 1890. 2 vols.

Wernle, P. Beginnings of Christianity. Tr. by G. A. Bienemann. N. Y., G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1903–4. 2 vols.

Wrede, W. Das Messiasgeheimniss in den Evangelien. Göttingen, Vanderhoeck u. Ruprecht, 1901. pp. 291.

Zenos, A. C. The Teaching of Jesus. N. Y., Tract Society, 1905. pp. 169.

Zöckler, O. Die Apokryphen des Alten Testaments. München, C. H. Beck, 1891. pp. 495.

232.9Q
H631

232.9Q
H631

Hitchcock, A.W

Psychology of Jesus.

232.9Q
H631